

LITURGICAL LATIN

ITS ORIGINS and CHARACTER

THREE LECTURES

By

Christine Mohrmann

Professor at the Roman Catholic University of
Nijmegen and at the University of Amsterdam



The Catholic University of America Press
Washington 17, D. C.
1957

These lectures were delivered on May 8, 9, and 10, 1957, and are published under the Monsignor George A. Dougherty Foundation of the Catholic University of America.

Copyright, 1957

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY
OF AMERICA PRESS, INC.

PREFACE

In the three lectures which it was my privilege to deliver at the Catholic University of America in the spring of 1957 and which are now, thanks to its Monsignor George A. Dougherty Foundation, appearing in print, I attempted to characterize Liturgical Latin as a hieratic, sacral language, and to throw some light upon its relationship to Early Christian Latin. The significance of Liturgical Latin is twofold. As a sacral, uniform language, it elevates the official prayer of the Church above the changeability and multiformity of the national languages of communication, and it serves as a link, and a direct link, with the first centuries of Christianity and the heritage of the Early Christian Fathers.

The study of Liturgical Latin is thus of necessity bound up with that of Early Christian Latin, from which it proceeds. In the short space of three lectures, it was impossible for me to go more deeply into the fascinating phenomenon of the "Christianisation" of the language of Rome, a process completed during the first centuries of our era and one which transformed the Latin language into an adequate instrument for the expression of Christian life and thought. I was, however, able to deal more fully with this "prehistory" of Liturgical Latin in a series of lectures given during the summer of 1956 at the University of Notre Dame. A résumé of these

lectures will, I hope, soon appear in printed form.

For further information on the development of Early Christian Latin as the group language of the early Christians, may I refer to the publications of the "School of Nijmegen" appearing in the series *Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva*, and to the pertinent articles published in the journal *Vigiliae Christianae*.

The renewed interest in the life of the Early Church which is becoming increasingly evident, and which is closely bound up with the revival of a liturgical consciousness, justifies the hope that this modest work may also find a public outside the narrow circle of specialists. May it be instrumental in assuring that the true value of this precious heritage, the Latin prayer language of the Church, may be appreciated in still wider circles. This heritage, as I said above, is a link which binds us with our Early Christian past and ensures our present unity-in-prayer—*vinculum unitatis*—in a double sense.

I should like to express an especial word of thanks to Professor Martin R. P. McGuire, who was the moving spirit behind these lectures and their publication. I should like also to thank both him and his colleague, Professor Bernard M. Peebles, for preparing the manuscript for the printer and for a careful reading of the proofs.

CHRISTINE MOHRMANN.

CONTENTS

I. SACRED AND HIERATIC LANGUAGES	1
II. EARLY CHRISTIAN LATIN AND THE ORIGINS OF LITURGICAL LATIN	30
III. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF LITURGICAL LATIN	60
NOTES	91

I

Sacred and Hieratic Languages

IF ONE wishes to study the phenomenon of sacred and hieratic languages, one must first rid himself of the still widespread conception that the only function of human language is that of communication; in other words, that language only serves to make known, as clearly and efficiently as possible, that which the speaker wishes to convey to his hearer. The so-called social school of linguistics dealt especially with this concrete and practical function of language in human society, and laid far too much emphasis upon it. As a result, the value of language was assessed too much in terms of its efficiency as a means of intercourse between human beings and as an instrument of communication.¹ From this one might conclude that the most perfect language would be a linguistic system which, with the help of the fewest possible words and other linguistic aids, would provide the clearest possible means of communication. It is an established fact that, usually, the greater the number of people using a particular language as a me-

dium of communication, the simpler this language becomes and the fewer linguistic elements it requires. Its grammar and morphology become less complicated, its vocabulary becomes standardized, the whole linguistic instrument becomes straightforward and uncomplicated and thus undoubtedly more practical for use in everyday intercourse. So we see, for example, how the two most widely spoken languages, English and Spanish, show an increasing tendency to simplify their syntactical and morphological structures. Or, to take an example from the ancient world: in later Antiquity, as Latin developed more and more into a world language, the breakdown of its syntactic and morphological system followed rapidly.

A language is not merely a sort of code to facilitate intercourse between human beings in daily life. The phenomenon of language is infinitely more complicated and has many more functions than that of communication among people. If one wishes to study the different functions of language, one of the first problems to arise is that of the relationship between language and thought, a problem with which I can hardly deal fully here, nor do I intend to do so. In my opinion, some modern scholars go rather too far in asserting in this connection that no thought is possible without language. I think

Russell expresses a correct and less extreme opinion when he says: "Language serves not only to express thoughts, but to make possible thoughts which could not exist without it. It is sometimes maintained that there can be no thought without language, but to this view I cannot assent. I hold that there can be thought . . . without language. But however that may be, it cannot be denied that all fairly elaborate thoughts require words."²

Besides the dialogue between one person and another, one has also the dialogues regularly carried on inside oneself. The dialogue between one person and another, however, is in no way always obliged to serve the purpose of communication in the technical sense of the word. De Saussure, and after him Bally especially, have already pointed out that language by no means serves only to communicate actual facts but is also the interpreter of all the motions and workings of the human mind, and, above all, of human sensibility. Language is also—as it has been termed in the Geneva School—a medium of expression. Whereas, as we have seen, language used purely as a means of communication normally strives towards a certain degree of efficiency, which results in linguistic simplification and standardization, language as expression usually shows a tendency to become richer and more

subtle. It aims at becoming, by every possible means, more expressive and more picturesque, and it may try to attain this heightened power of expression both by the coining of new words and by the preservation of antiquated elements already abandoned by the language as communication. Thus language as expression also serves the cause of linguistic art.³ It provides the material for the artistic mode of expression which gives rise to literary works of art. This literary form of expression may become removed, to a greater or lesser degree, from the standardized language of communication. If the writer falls back on his own personal basis of expression—as we repeatedly find happening in modern poetry, what is written becomes incomprehensible to the non-initiated. The work serves as an outlet for the author's urge to express himself and can at best only be approached from a psychological standpoint. The social communication element is more or less eliminated.

In most cases, however, expression aims at the preservation and enrichment of the traditional communication elements in its endeavor to put into words sensitive and artistic experiences as well as material facts. Fully thirty-five years ago Hugo Schuchardt became conscious of this conflict between language as communication and language as expression, and he tried to define it

in his much quoted phrase: "Aus der Not geboren gipfelt die Sprache in der Kunst": "Language born of necessity finds its highest point in art."⁴ I am only too conscious that an analysis such as that just given is scarcely acceptable in our present cultural climate. There is now a general tendency to reduce the things of the world about us, in the widest sense, to their scientific formulas, and language does not escape the trend. Yet on the other hand people are gradually becoming more and more conscious that this attitude of mind means an atrophy of our power to seize the essence of things. Even in the realm of linguistic studies the consequences of rationalism and positivism have made themselves felt . . . and the essence of language could be reduced to the limited possibilities of a medium of communication. But here, too, other conceptions are slowly succeeding in breaking through.

Expression can have various aims: the establishing of contact between one person and another, of man with himself, and also of man with God. Prayer, considered from a linguistic point of view, usually lies more within the domain of expression than in that of communication, although here one must naturally allow for differences and degrees. Not only personal prayer, with meditative prayer as its highest form, be-

longs to the realm of expression, but also the collective prayer of the Church in her liturgy. One must, however, bear in mind that certain parts of our liturgy cannot be considered as prayer in the strict sense of the word and are therefore not included in this qualification. I am thinking, for example, of texts like the Epistle and Gospel in the liturgy of the Mass, which are read aloud, and also of "confessional" texts like the Creed. When speaking thus of prayer as expression, and of the linguistic form of prayer in our liturgy, such liturgical elements must naturally be left out of consideration. I think that this distinction is extremely important in the consideration of the desirability or otherwise—in our time—of retaining Latin as a liturgical language. But I shall return to this question in another connection.

In prayer considered as expression—in this case it makes no essential difference whether we speak of personal or collective prayer—the dialogue no longer lies on the human plane. We are here concerned with a transcendental contact between the praying individual and the divine being. For this reason the dominant element is no longer that of intelligibility, as in human dialogue. This is replaced, at least in part, by more subtle elements, partly spiritual, partly affective, which can be crystalized in the rhythm,

the tone of delivery, or in the style. There often appears a certain hankering after archaism—essentially a traditional stylistic phenomenon, a preference for older modes of expression no longer current in everyday linguistic usage. Such archaizing and stylizing tendencies can be carried so far that the language of religious expression becomes incomprehensible for outsiders.⁵

Thus, in the phenomenon of the gift of tongues as analyzed by St. Paul 1 Cor. 14, we see—in an early Christian connection—an extreme case of linguistic expression in which the communication element seems completely eliminated. On the other hand, one might consider the miracle of Whitsunday, the gift of tongues on the occasion of the first preaching by the Apostles, as a miraculous amplification of language as communication. In 1 Cor. 14, St. Paul clearly distinguishes between the charism of the unintelligible “gift of tongues” and that of the power of *προφητεῖν*, which conferred supernatural but communicable knowledge (*γνώσις*). He sees in the gift of tongues, which he himself also possessed, an individual phenomenon of little service to the community, whereas that of *προφητεῖν* leads to the *οἰκοδομῆν* (“strengthening”) of the community and the conversion of unbelievers. In this passage, which is so puzzling in many respects, St. Paul clearly emphasizes his preference

for the social element of *προφητεῖαν* as a charismatic communication element as contrasted with the one-sided expression, "gift of tongues."⁶

But, to take up again the thread of our argument, one may say in general that prayer—leaving aside certain cases of the perfect "silent prayer"—belongs to the domain of linguistic expression, even in those cases where one speaks of mental prayer. The Abbé Brémond has already pointed out that even mental prayer is also a prayer with words, when he says: "En dehors de certaines expériences peu communes . . . (l'oraison de silence par exemple, où, du reste, se glissent toujours, me semble-t-il, quelques mots imperceptibles) l'expression 'prière vocale' est un pléonasme . . . Pour l'immense majorité des humains, prier, c'est parler à Dieu."⁷ Abbot Salmon rightly adds to this remark that prayer can be non-vocal, i.e., mental, without being "oraison de silence."⁸

The question may well be asked: What is our position with regard to the evaluation and appreciation of the phenomenon of language as expression in all its different forms? We are obliged to record that, under the influence of positivism, people, especially people in non-professional circles, are still inclined to regard language as pure communication, as a utilitarian instrument, as a means of social intercourse, as lan-

guage par excellence and as the only real linguistic phenomenon. Or, to put it another way: every linguistic form of expression is examined and judged according to its social utility and the ease with which it can be understood. The colloquial language is *the* language; the ideals of efficiency and intelligibility, the idea of language as communication, dominate the conception of language as a human phenomenon. People thus tend to forget that language as expression—which in many cases includes language as a literary tool—is certainly just as important a phenomenon, and plays a great role in many spheres in human life. In this latter case, i.e., language as a means of expression, it is not merely a question of the individual element, the personal style of the writer or poet. This phenomenon can also occur as a mode of expression based on a collective tradition. Linguistic form is then no longer chiefly and exclusively a medium of communication but rather the medium of expression of a group living according to a certain tradition. In such cases linguistic usage is often deliberately stylized, and there exist language and style forms, transmitted from generation to generation, in which people deliberately deviate from language as communication, as current in everyday life, in order to obtain a certain artistic, religious, or spiritual effect. Here we have the very

opposite of the matter-of-fact development of languages as media of communication as they are so rapidly evolving in our times. This is probably the reason why the man of today, when confronted with the phenomenon of stylized languages as the traditional means of expression of a collectivity, languages, not only accepted but maintained in use by countless generations, finds them incomprehensible, peculiar and, therefore, usually to be discarded. Thus we can understand too how the modern Christian, in the liturgical prayer texts, for example, longs first and foremost for intelligibility, clarity, and lucidity; we understand also how it was possible for a translation of the Psalms to be made in our generation in which the mystery of the ancient prayer texts has been eliminated at all costs in favor of a lucidity and clarity dictated by a certain historical positivism.

But to return to our general considerations. The question at issue is thus the traditional, stylized use of linguistic elements which have little or no contact any longer with contemporary life, but which continue to survive in another, non-material connection. Whenever this phenomenon occurs in the field of literature, one usually speaks of stylized language. In connection with religion, one commonly speaks of sacral or hieratic languages. Actually, considered from

a linguistic point of view, we have the same phenomenon in both cases. Within the framework of a definite tradition, an artificial, often archaizing, style or linguistic form is created which, in its isolated position, reduces the element of comprehensibility to a greater or lesser degree in favor of other elements preferred for their artistic or spiritual potentialities, and lying more in the domain of expression than that of communication.

One of the artificial languages about which we know most and from which we can thus most easily gain an idea of the nature of this phenomenon is that of the Homeric poems. Homeric Greek, or rather the artificial language of the Greek epic, as we know it from the Homeric epics, from Hesiod and, in a more or less diluted form, from poetic inscriptions, was never a spoken language and never led an organic life in a civilized community. It is a combination of heterogeneous elements which together form the stylized instrument employed by the epic poets. It consists essentially of a great number of fixed expressions, word combinations, and turns of speech which must have had their origin in a long tradition of poetic oral improvisation, but which are also employed, with great virtuosity, by later poets who committed their works to writing. The epic vocabulary is a remarkable mixture of

very early and later elements, of words and word forms taken from different Greek dialects. Its morphology is even more colorful, with its numerous nominal and verbal forms, some of which, it appears, were created by the epic narrative tradition itself. Phonetically it bears obvious traces of a declaimed language.⁹ This heterogeneous combination of various elements, which immediately sufficed to conjure up for the Greeks the world of the epic and which, as the consecrated language of narrative poetry, formed a structural unit, had a very long life. It not only provided the material for two of the greatest works in the history of world literature, but continued to be used for centuries as the language of epic poetry. Generation after generation of Greeks were brought up on it, and this explains its viability. Every generation took the trouble to steep itself in this artificial idiom, and in this way a great national artistic asset was preserved. As late as the fifth century A.D. a Christian poet, Nonnos of Panopolis in the Egyptian Thebaid, wrote a paraphrase of St. John's Gospel in Homeric Greek.

We find a second example in the Greek choral lyric, which for centuries employed the Doric dialect even after that dialect had long died out as a spoken language. At the beginning of the fifth century A.D., Synesius, Bishop of Cyrene,

still composed his half-Christian, half-Platonic hymns in the Doric dialect.

In speaking of the choral lyric, we have already approached the religious field and the phenomenon of sacral and hieratic languages. In epic and lyric poetry we found a stylization which could be carried to such a point as to lose practically all contact with the contemporary colloquial language. Similarly, we observe a form of stylization, usually archaizing or at least conservative, in "religious" languages. This phenomenon is based on a general human tendency, found among the most diverse peoples and cultures. Whenever man comes into contact with the divine, his language shows a tendency to disassociate itself from ordinary colloquial speech. It is as though contact with the divine draws man out of his ordinary life, and this is reflected in his language. But this is not confined to language: other elements also undergo an hieraticizing process. So, for example, we have the phenomenon of hieratic liturgical vestments, which must similarly be considered as a drawing apart from ordinary life.

The memory of and contact with sacral languages is often given concrete expression in the supposition of the existence of a language of gods, spirits, or, among Christians, of angels. One has only to think of St. Paul, 1 Cor. 13.1:

"If I should speak with the tongues of men and of *angels*." It is again the Homeric epic which provides us with interesting material in this respect. In Homer continual mention is made of a language of the gods, and we shall probably not be straying far from the truth if we see in the usually etymologically obscure words of this so-called divine language, a last echo of ancient sacral words. One repeatedly finds the "human" word beside the "divine."¹⁰ In cases however where the poet did not explain such words taken from the "language of the gods," even the Greeks themselves were not always able to understand them. Thus in *Odyssey* 10.305, we hear of a magic plant "called *μῶλον* by the gods." The blood of the gods is called *ἰχὼρ*, that of men, *αἷμα*. Here we can point to a remarkable Christian parallel. In the *Sacramentarium Leonianum* we repeatedly meet the poetic word *cruor* used for the blood of pagan sacrificial animals, but also for that of the Christian martyrs. *Cruor*, however, is never used of the Sacred Blood of Christ; this is always called *sanguis*. In the stylization of the liturgical language, the traditional poetic word is felt to be "profane," or at least not suitable to be applied to Christ.¹¹

Typically "sacred" words were also in circulation in Orphic and Pythagorean circles, as we are told by Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 5.8 ff.,

and by others. One is also reminded in this respect of the magic words found in the papyri. In many cases a certain magical element does indeed play a part, namely, the widely disseminated popular belief in the mysterious power of words. But however this may be, we see how, from these primitive elements which are partly a survival of a belief in magic, and which also conjure up the idea of a mythical world where everything is "different," a consciousness develops that the world of the divine demands another language from that used in everyday life.

After these general, theoretical considerations we are now faced with the question whether, and, if so, to what degree, we can find in our earliest Christian texts symptoms of stylization pointing to the birth of a hieratic sacral language for use in prayer and in the liturgy.

In seeking an answer to this question we must first of all bear in mind that, as far as the earliest period is concerned, we are dealing exclusively with Greek. For, from the time of the Apostolic preaching until the second half of the second century, Greek was the only oecumenical language of Christianity. And even when, in the course of the second century, the early Christian communities in the West gradually evolved a Christian colloquial language and began to translate the Scriptures—at first only those parts

perhaps which were read aloud during liturgical gatherings, Greek still remained for a long time the language of liturgical prayer, at least of the Eucharistic Liturgy. This state of affairs continued in Rome until well into the fourth century. In North Africa, however, Latin seems to have penetrated into the liturgy somewhat earlier.¹² Yet here too the initial stage was Greek. In this connection it is interesting to note that in the *Passio Felicitatis et Perpetuae*, which originated in Carthage in the first years of the third century, the reflexion of Greek liturgical elements is still quite clearly to be seen. Indeed, it has long been agreed that in the visions of the martyrs described in the *Passio*, we find elements taken from the liturgy. It is certainly remarkable that in the passage reflecting the Communion Rite, there occurs the Greek word *tegnon* (which was never current in Early Christian Latin): *Bene venisti tegnon* (4.9). This Greek word, however, does not directly reflect a liturgical formula, it merely serves to suggest, a "liturgical" atmosphere. Much more remarkable is the triple repetition of Greek *hagios* of Isaias' vision (Is. 6.2) in the description of the reception of the martyrs in the heavenly paradise: *et introivimus et audivimus vocem unitam dicentem: Agios, agios, agios sine cessatione* (12.2). This is all the more remarkable since the *sanctus*

of the heavenly liturgy occurs neither in the well known description of Justin (*Ap.* 66-67), nor in the *Apostolica traditio* of Hippolytus (ed. Dix 7-9),¹³ whereas we already know of its existence in the early Alexandrian liturgy through Origen (*De princ.* 4.3.14).¹⁴ For our argument, it is not so much the liturgical datum that is important as the fact that the author—or authoress, in the narrative of the visions, deliberately attempted a stylization by the addition of Greek elements which evoked a liturgical atmosphere.

But to return to the earliest examples of Christian Greek. Can we, in the earliest Christian period, find anything which indicates a hieratic stylization in liturgical texts or in prayer texts in general? One must remember here that Early Christian Greek was very strongly influenced by the language of the Septuagint, and that this language, to a Greek, sounded more or less exotic, colorful, and stylized. Moreover, the earliest Christians, at least those converted from Judaism, were familiar with the phenomenon of hieratic stylization. They knew it from their own experience, and this holds good both for the Aramaic-speaking Palestinian Christians, who were still familiar with Hebrew as a sacral language, and for the Hellenistic Jews, who had in the Septuagint an admittedly Hellenized translation of the Bible, yet one which still clearly

reflected the stylistic character of the original text. Early Christianity was thus certainly predisposed to the creation of a hieratic language. It is also clear, in my opinion, that the earliest Christian literature, up to and including the Apostolic Fathers, was far more influenced by the Jewish than by the contemporary Hellenistic style tradition. This fact, however, does not exclude the possibility of some traces of Hellenistic influence in certain texts.¹⁵ When nineteenth-century scholars, Fr. Overbeck, for example, and E. Norden, in our own century, argue that Christian literature, as literature, first begins after the time of the Apostolic Fathers, i.e., that it commences with the Apologists, I think they have rightly felt that, in all that has gone before, the form is moulded more by the Jewish and by the very earliest Christian tradition than by the Hellenistic.¹⁶ The deliberate *rapprochement* with the Hellenistic tradition begins with the Apologists and in particular with Clement of Alexandria and his circle. All the earlier texts are in general more indebted to the stylistic processes inspired by the Septuagint than to those of the Classical tradition. I can thus agree with E. Norden on this point too when he says that the parallelism, coupled with antithetical sentence construction found in St. Paul among others, features of style which remind us of cer-

tain artifices of the Second Sophistic, are in fact essentially different, and are based on Old Testament models.¹⁷ The same is true to a still greater extent of the New Testament *Cantica* which usually show Old Testament inspiration and also adopt the form schemes of the biblical poetry and especially that of the Psalms.

In the light of what has just been said, it now follows that, considered within the framework of late Classical culture, the earliest Christian texts form a distinct group more or less distinguished by an "exotic" tradition, which as such deviates from the Hellenistic language and style picture. This special picture is characterized by a specifically Christian stamp, related to the Palestinian and Hellenistic-Jewish tradition. Yet we cannot simply say that we have here a sacral language. The most we can say is that we can discern here the first beginnings of a Christian style.

But the problem does not end here. In the New Testament and other very early Christian texts, we find certain elements which indicate that even earliest Christianity was sensible to those forms of expression by which the sacred, often almost inexpressible, was preferably indicated by foreign elements not forming part of the familiar language. These foreign elements were usually drawn from the milieu in which Our

Lord lived and the earliest preaching of Christianity took place. This is all the more remarkable since Greek—and this holds good for later Christian Greek—had a pronounced dislike of foreign elements. Few languages contain so small a number of loanwords as Greek, and if one compares Early Christian Greek with Early Christian Latin, one is immediately struck by the way in which the Greek Christians were able to manage with the existing Greek linguistic material; even Christian lexicological neologisms are not numerous, whereas the Latins were very often obliged to have recourse to loanwords.¹⁸ Nevertheless, we find in the earliest Greek Christian texts a number of Aramaic and Hebrew words and expressions, taken directly from Jesus' preaching. In most cases, however, it is not so much a question of linguistic borrowing—very few of these words found a place in the Christian vocabulary, but rather of a process of style which brings us into very close contact with the actual words spoken by Christ. In the Sermon on the Mount (Mt. 6.24) and in the Parable of the Unjust Steward (Lk. 16.9, 11, 13) Jesus, in speaking of money and riches, uses the Aramaic word *mammona*, and the Evangelists reproduce the word without explaining it. This is one of the few Aramaic words which have persisted in Christian linguistic usage. At the cur-

ing of the man born deaf and dumb (Mk. 7.34) we again hear Jesus' own language: ἑφθαθά; but here Mark adds: ὁ ἔστιν διανοίχθηναι: *quod est aperire*. In the description of another miracle, the raising from the dead of Jairus' daughter (Mk. 5.41), we have: ταλιθὰ κοῦμ: "Girl, I say to thee, arise," and again the Evangelist adds: ὁ ἔστιν μεθερμηνευόμενον Τὸ κοράσιον, σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειρε. It is certainly not by chance that we find these Aramaic phrases in the account of Jesus' miracles: the supernatural, miraculous element is heightened by these words which, to the Greeks, sounded so exotic. Jesus' cry in the Garden of Gethsemane: Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ (Mk. 14.36), demands a special discussion. As Kittel states, and as St. John Chrysostom before him had pointed out, this form, in which the suffix of the first person is not expressed, has the meaning of "my father."¹⁹ This word *abba* is taken directly from the colloquial language, where *abba* was the familiar form by which a child addressed its father, just as we, in similar cases, use "father" without a possessive pronoun. Thus, Christ uses here the simplest and most intimate word, as when a child speaks to its father. This use of *abba* must have made a great impression on the first Christians: there was an intimate quality about it, difficult to translate. We can therefore understand why St. Paul preserved it in his

Epistles, as, for example, in Rom. 8.15: ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας ἐν ᾧ κράζομεν Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ: "You have received a spirit of adoption as sons, by virtue of which we cry, Abba! Father!"²⁰ I shall return to this passage directly, but in this connection it is interesting to note that the Apostle of the Gentiles places beside the intimate Aramaic *abba* the Hellenistic juridical expression *υἱοθεσία* ("adoption"), a term which was probably more easily understood by his Hellenistic readers.

We see thus how the Evangelists, and especially St. Mark, when referring to Jesus' own words in His miracles and in dramatic passages in the story of the Passion, retain Aramaic words even when they add a Greek translation. The Evangelists resort to this process, so unusual in Greek, out of respect for the word in the form in which it was originally pronounced.²¹ But from this we learn a very important fact: that there existed an attitude which considered the word as a very concrete thing, something that must not be interfered with because it is unique in its authenticity. And still we have not yet attained the stage of a sacral or hieratic language. For this we must go yet another step further. When St. Paul speaks of Christ's cry "Abba! Father!" and thereby repeats the word employed by Our Lord when He turned to His heavenly Father, he is undoubtedly alluding to

the Our Father, the prayer taught to us by Our Lord Himself. Here the Aramaic word must clarify the particular nuance of *πάτερ ἡμῶν* (Mt. 6.9) and *πάτερ* (Lk. 11.2). Thus in St. Paul, the words, *Ἀββᾶ κράζειν*, seem directly connected with the liturgical use of the Our Father, and, as such, it is a liturgical term: "to say *Abba*" is "to pray." This brings us now to another Aramaic term which we know for certain was used in an Early Christian prayer. And it is significant that this exotic term reflects the dominating idea of the first generations of Christians: the Second Coming of Christ, expected at any time and eagerly longed for.²³ The term to which I refer is the Aramaic *maranatha*. At the end of the First Epistle to the Corinthians (1 Cor. 16.22) St. Paul says in a personal postscript: *εἴ τις οὐ φιλεῖ τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, ἦτω ἀνάθεμα. Μαράν ἀθά*: "If any man does not love the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema. Maranatha." Furthermore we find in the *Didache* (10.6), at the end of the eucharistic celebration, the following prayer text:

Ἐλθέτω Χάρις καὶ παρελθέτω ὁ κόσμος οὗτος.
 Ὡσαννὰ τῷ θεῷ Δαυίδ.
 εἴ τις ἅγιός ἐστιν, ἐρχέσθω.
 εἴ τις οὐκ ἔστι, μετανοεῖτω.
 μαράν ἀθά. ἀμήν.

"May the 'Charis' come and may this world pass away!
 Hosanna to the God of David!
 He that is holy, let him come;
 He that is not, let him be converted.
 Maranatha! Amen."

There has been much discussion as to how *maranatha* must be interpreted: as an indicative statement, "The Lord is coming," or as an imperative, "Come, O Lord!" In both cases the cry voices the ardent longing for the Second Coming of Christ; it is a sort of "keyword" of the first generations of Christians.²³ St. John Chrysostom and Theodoret have interpreted the word in an indicative sense, as the announcement of the Second Coming of the Lord.²⁴ On the other hand, the words at the end of the Apocalypse of St. John, behind which we surmise the Aramaic *maranatha*: Ἀμήν, ἔρχου, Κύριε Ἰησοῦ (Apoc. 22.20), "Amen! Come Lord Jesus!", seem to point to an imperative. For our purposes it is not important to know which of the two interpretations is correct. For my part, I think the possibility also exists that we have here an analogous case with some of the earliest doxologies which were first taken as being indicative statements and afterwards as optative.²⁵

What is important for our argument is that, in this primitive eucharistic prayer—the *Didache* dates from the first half of the second century but may really go back to an even older tradition—we find, first of all, a typically biblical, Semitic parallelism; and secondly, that exotic biblical elements are strongly represented: ὡσαννὰ τῷ θεῷ Δαυὶδ (with a variant ὡφ in Mt. 21.9, 15),

μαρναθεί, and ἀμήν. Thus we see in this early Greek prayer text, on the one hand, a linking up with the Old Testament sentence structure and parallelism—such as we find also in the New Testament canticles and prayers, and, on the other, the introduction of Aramaic and Hebrew elements which clearly indicate a striving after sacral stylization. There is here an obvious differentiation from the language of everyday life, a stylization which is also manifested elsewhere by the use of foreign linguistic elements. In this prayer text, too, there is no longer question of a translation of the exotic elements as we found in the Gospels, in narrative texts which really belong to the realm of communication. In liturgical usage we are essentially concerned with expression elements, and as such the words are not translated.

Greek liturgy will not continue in this course, at least in so far as the introduction of foreign words is concerned. Later other paths will be followed, yet it remains remarkable to find this hieratic form established in this ancient eucharistic text. May I also remark here that the whole of the earliest eucharistic terminology is deliberately isolated from the language of everyday life: κλάω τὸν ἄρτον, "to break bread," is certainly not a common expression for taking part in a meal,²⁶ and the modern liturgists who would

like to view the earliest eucharistic celebration as a "gathering round the kitchen table" certainly do not find support in the testimony of the earliest terminology. The term *εὐχαριστία*, as we know, is derived from the Jewish prayer tradition.²⁷

It is not my intention to discuss here the development of Greek liturgical language and style. I merely wish to indicate briefly how even the earliest Christian prayer texts show the desire for differentiation from the ordinary spoken language. This tendency can lead to the use of foreign elements, whenever these foreign elements are related to the earliest Christian tradition. For one must never forget that Christianity will forever remain bound up with the historical fact of the Act of Redemption, which took place in an historical milieu. We find traces of this milieu in the earliest prayer texts, but there already they may serve the purpose of hieratic stylization which gives the prayer a completely distinctive character.

After these first attempts to create a sacral style, we see in Greek the appearance of various prayer styles. I must content myself here with brief indications.

The element of free creative activity in the liturgy of the earliest times means that we can speak of different prayer styles or forms, but

scarcely of different (fixed) prayer texts.²⁸ We shall see later how, notably in the West, where free composition remained in vogue for a very long time in certain liturgical prayers, it is precisely this system which leads to a marked traditional prayer style. The same thing happens as in the earliest epic Greek. There exist a number of fixed stylistic elements or patterns which are used by the creative (this is not always the same as improvising) liturgist, and which, with slight variations, can be fitted together again and again like a mosaic. However this may be, it is clear that we must regard a prayer formula such as the eucharistic prayer, handed down to us by Hippolytus in his *Apostolica traditio* (ed. Dix 7-9), more as a specimen than as a fixed and definite prayer text. In this early text I think we can already discern some traces of the clarity and lucidity but also of the reserve of the later Roman liturgy. In this strongly Christological prayer we have already a sample of the clear succinctness which will later become one of the characteristics of the later Roman liturgy. What strikes us most in Hippolytus' prayer is the absence of Old Testament elements which are so strongly represented in other, partly later, Greek liturgies, and which go back to a synagogical tradition.²⁹ We find an echo of this in the résumés of eucharistic prayers in the fifth *Mystagogical Catachesis* of Cyril (or

John) of Jerusalem. But at a very early date there must also have existed a style which seems to draw upon a philosophical Hellenistic tradition, and which seeks, among other things, to capture the indefinable quality of the Divine Being by long series of compound adjectives with alpha-privative as their initial element, in the manner of the Classical philosophers. We already find this process of style in the *Anaphora* of Serapion of Thmuis: ἀγέννητε Θεέ, ἀνέξεχρίαστε, ἀνέκφραστε, ἀκατανόητε πάσῃ γενετῇ ὑποστάσει: "unborn God, inscrutable, ineffable, incomprehensible for every born mortal."³⁰ We find another typically Hellenistic style process in the famous hymn on Christ at the end of the *Paedagogus* of Clement of Alexandria. This is a litany, very symmetrically constructed, with extremely significant invocations, more literary than sacral. Baumstark thought it not impossible that this, or a similar hymn, was used in the Alexandrian liturgy.

Thus we see how, from the very earliest times, Christians sought for prayer forms which were far removed, in their style and mode of expression, from the language of everyday life. This tendency was combined with a conscious striving after sacral forms of expression. Already at an early period the East did not disdain to seek a *rapprochement* with certain profane literary traditions, but, on the other hand, the Easterners

never abandoned the connection with the biblical style which characterized the earliest prayers. We shall now have to examine the manner in which the West, and in particular Rome, set about the creation of a liturgical style, and we shall find that the West, like the East, sought after a sacral style by which what was sacred might be approached with awe and reverence.

II

Early Christian Latin and the Origins of Liturgical Latin

WE HAVE SEEN, in the first lecture, that the earliest Christian preaching in the West as well as in the East was delivered in Greek. The earliest Christian communities in the West, in Italy, in Gaul, and in North Africa, employed Greek as their everyday language and as that of the liturgy. The earliest Christian writings known to us in the West are also in Greek. This general use of Greek in the Western communities is, however, not as strange as might appear at first sight. Greek, that is to say the common Greek language of communication, the Koine, was, in the first centuries of our era, an international language spoken throughout the entire Roman Empire. This does not mean, as many still seem to think, that Greek was the most common language in Rome and in other cities of the West. We can say, however, that at this period Greek was, on the one hand, the language of

higher culture, known by the intellectuals of the West, but not on that account regularly employed in conversation, and, on the other, the normal everyday language of a swarming Eastern proletariat of the downtrodden masses, dispersed throughout the Western part of the Empire. Greek was the colloquial speech of thousands and thousands of displaced persons, prisoners of war, slaves and freemen, little merchants and sailors who, driven from their original homes, led a hand-to-mouth existence in the large cities, especially in the seaports, of the West. Among this cosmopolitan population, the Hellenistic Jews, who also used Greek as the language of their cult, formed an important, isolated group.¹

It was above all in the large cities of the West that Christianity first took root among the Greek-speaking masses. From the beginning there were undoubtedly Latin-speaking Christians in the earliest communities, and, when people from the higher classes also adopted Christianity, they formed a bilingual element in the Christian communities. This element certainly played a definite role in the gradual Latinization of the liturgy and in the translation of Christian texts into Latin. It was considered quite normal for Greek to be, in the beginning, the official language and colloquial idiom of the

Christian communities, since Greek was the normal language of the Eastern religions which inundated the West at this period. It is thus that the earliest Christian communities were usually considered by outsiders as forming part of one of the many Eastern cults, or else they were taken for Jewish communities. But the situation undergoes a gradual change as early as the second century. When Christianity really took root among the populations of the West, the number of Latin-speaking Christians naturally increased rapidly, and slowly but surely the Christian communities became Latinized. This process, however, began at a time when the communities had already developed into well-organized and consolidated groups with their own way of life, based on a common belief and a common hope. These communities had thus come to possess a strong group-consciousness, founded, in the first place, on the conviction that they were different from the rest of humanity and the bearers of a new doctrine, a new faith, and a new form of life. The Christians felt themselves to be a *tertium genus*, distinct from Jews and pagans alike.²

The fact that this Latinizing process began comparatively late, at a time when the Christian communities were to a large extent consolidated, explains why Early Christian Latin, as we find

it in the comparatively rare texts of the second and first part of the third centuries, appears from the very beginning as a linguistic variant bearing all the signs of being the differentiating language of a closed group. If we compare the initial stages of this group-language with the earliest examples of Christian Greek, we can easily establish a few general distinguishing traits. These differences can be explained by the circumstances in which Early Christian Latin originates and develops, circumstances which differ from those contributing to the formation of Early Christian Greek. Christian Latin begins as a slowly developing linguistic variant which on the one hand, within the circle of the Christian groups, slowly breaks away from the general, spoken, profane Latin, and, on the other, gradually takes the place of the old Greek of the Christian communities. Two or three generations of Christians in the West had employed Greek as their medium of communication. In this manner a technical terminology for the main Christian ideas and institutions had already been built up. Greek had been the language of preaching, the prayers were Greek, and, most important, the Scriptures, the Old and New Testaments, were studied and read aloud in Greek. Thus the rise of Christian Latin was marked by

a slow ousting of Greek. During this process the current Greek words for concrete things and institutions were usually retained and were destined to continue in use as loanwords throughout the centuries, even being incorporated into our modern languages.³ These words were already so familiar to the Christians, they were already so bound up with their institutional life, that no one—apart from some purist writer—thought of replacing them by Latin words. For example, when Tertullian attempted to replace the Greek βαπτίζω by the Latin *tinguere*, his innovation was not adopted into the language.⁴ Throughout the centuries *baptizare* will remain the normal word for “baptize.” Even in the Romance languages and in some of the Germanic languages it will continue to survive as a *formation savante*. Some of the Germanic languages, however, will adopt the process of “translating” the Greek word into their own language. But Old Norse goes its own way with the use of the beautiful word, *kristnan*, “to make Christian,” for “baptize,” and English still knows the two forms, “christen” and “baptize.”

But to return to the linguistic situation in the first centuries of the Christian era. In cases where the Latin Christians substituted a Latin term for an existing Greek word, it can happen that the Latin word does not reflect the earliest

Christian meaning of the Greek, but rather the semantic situation existing at the time when the substitution took place. Thus, in my opinion, the Latin *sacramentum*, when it takes the place of the Greek *μυστήριον* in the second century, reflects the meaning of this word at that particular time.⁵

There was yet another difference in the situation in the West as compared with that in the East. The Greek Christians had inherited a Greek text of the Old Testament from the Jews and this idiom of the Septuagint formed the starting point for Early Christian Greek. Moreover, the Christians converted from Hellenistic Judaism brought with them the tradition of Hellenistic-Judaic Greek. But no Jewish Latin translation of the Bible existed in the West and the Jewish communities there employed Greek as the language of their cult.⁶ In this way, the Latin West lacked the point of departure which was so important for Greek. This also means that the Latin Christians were faced with the very difficult task of translating the Greek biblical texts, including the Old Testament, into Latin. I should be chary of asserting that the Latin Bible translations represent the first effort to reproduce the Christian ideology in Latin. I believe that the Latinizing process began with the colloquial language, and that the earliest

translators were thus able to draw on a Christian Latin vocabulary, limited though it may have been. On the other hand, it is evident that the earliest translators displayed a great deal of linguistic creativity and that they played an important part in the genesis and development of Early Christian Latin. In other words, the earliest Christian Latin, like the Greek, bears a strongly biblical imprint. The translating procedure, however, of the earliest translators, does not markedly differ from that employed by the translators of the Septuagint. We find the same word-for-word method of translation which differed so radically from that recommended by Cicero. The Latin translators of the Bible show the same reverence for the original text which had also been a guiding principle of the Septuagint translators. We see the same tendency simply to give a literal translation of words imbued with a strong biblical—or Christian—significance, thus imparting to existing words a meaning completely foreign to the original Latin sense. To give a few examples: *confiteri* is made to mean “to praise” (God); *claritas* or *gloria* is used for the manifestation of God’s glory; *vita*, for the life of the spirit commencing at baptism; *credere* (or *credidisse*), for the act of accepting the Christian faith; *humilitas*, for the lowly state of (sinful) man. Such Latin words are abruptly

forced to assume a meaning which they would never have adopted without the example of Biblical Greek—and also, in part, of the earliest Greek preaching. We cannot therefore be surprised that this abrupt burdening of existing Latin words with a biblical content was not always a success. Here the transition had not been prepared for by an existing Bible text or tradition such as the Greeks possessed in the Septuagint. In some cases Latin put up a show of resistance; it even happens that a biblical idea is obscured because the Latin word chosen suggested a meaning which did not correspond to the biblical conception. This is the case, for example, of *gloria*, selected by the European Bible translators as the equivalent of the biblical δόξα (Hebrew *kabod*). The earliest translators had exercised more caution in this respect by following the example of the oral instruction of the Rabbis and, in the biblical concept of *kabod*, stressing at one time the light element and at another that of power, which resulted in the double translation *claritas* and *maiestas*. The European Bible translators, however, chose *gloria* as the rendering of δόξα. The use of this word, so full of significance for the Romans, contributed to the development of a Christian idea of glory, which for a long time succeeded in pushing the biblical concept of δόξα into the background. It seems

to me that we are justified in assuming that the translations *claritas* and *maiestas* originated through direct contact with the contemporary Jewish tradition.⁷ Indeed, the remarkable analogy in the method of translation in general makes it very probable that the earliest Latin Bible translations were subject to Jewish influence. This influence may well have proceeded from Jewish-Christian circles.

The scrupulous manner in which the Latin translators of the Bible went to work had the practical result that the earlier translations departed considerably from what the Romans understood as "literature." The Latin biblical texts were written in an exotic style, and, furthermore, the translators drew on the resources of the Latin colloquial language, since this was more flexible than the traditional language of culture. It also offered more opportunities for expression, was less squeamish with regard to neologisms, and finally, since the Christians of the second century were, in part at least, recruited from the lower classes, it would be easier for them to understand.

One might think, under these circumstances, that this language and style of the Bible translations, which was of an exotic character and bore, in its audacious innovations, the stamp of Christian thought and belief, could easily have been

considered as a typically sacral and hieratic style. It is remarkable and at the same time characteristic of Latin traditionalism that, in the beginning at least, this was not so. During the first centuries of the Christian era the educated Latins found the form of the earliest Bible translations a source of embarrassment and an obstacle to the propagation of Christianity among the higher classes. This is all the more remarkable since, although the earliest Bible translations did indeed incorporate elements of popular speech, and although their style did depart from that of the Classical tradition, they were in no way "barbarous" and in fact reproduced the original texts with a good deal of finesse. We can safely reject as fable the idea—for which St. Augustine is also to a certain extent responsible—of "barbaric" Bible translations, executed by barely literate translators.⁸ And yet it was a long time before the literary prejudice against the Bible texts was overcome. This was mainly due to the enormous influence exercised by the traditional Classical literature, with which every educated person became acquainted in his youth and which formed the basis of all education. Since the Christians, too, frequented secular schools to the very end of Antiquity, even they had difficulty in freeing themselves from the literary normativism which dominated the whole

of late Classical education. The force and enthusiasm of the first generations, coupled with the scrupulous respect for the sacred texts and the Jewish tradition of translation, had safeguarded the earliest translators against the traditionalism which the ordinary Christian imbibed in the schools. It is only when the Christians had attained the peak of early Christian culture and of literary and artistic formation at the end of the fourth century that they become conscious of the distinctive character of the Christian tradition and recognized that it, too, had its own rights in the domain of literary style. St. Ambrose⁹ and St. Augustine¹⁰ were the first to see and acknowledge the beauty of the biblical style, even in the untraditional garb of the early translations, although in his youth Augustine had shared the contempt of preceding generations for this biblical language and style.¹¹ Later we shall have to look into the question of to what extent this modification in the feeling for style which we observe in St. Ambrose and St. Augustine in the fourth century also influenced the style of the liturgy.¹²

St. Jerome's revision of the Latin Bible texts undoubtedly toned down the exotic character of the earliest translations; nevertheless he deliberately retained the biblical style, which by then had already become traditional. I do not

believe, as has sometimes been suggested—above all by those who refuse to acknowledge the existence of a biblical stylistic tradition, that St. Jerome did not, or dared not, go further on account of pressure on the part of his conservative contemporaries, even had he wished to do so. There certainly did exist a traditional, conservative trend which was unwilling to tolerate any innovation or, at least, tried to limit it as much as possible, especially in cases where the biblical texts, as the Psalms and Canticles, played a liturgical role. The very fact however that St. Jerome's translation was subjected to literary and stylistic criticism proves that by this period people had begun to have some feeling for the venerable tradition of the old translations and for biblical style. Hence I do not believe that Jerome let himself be held back in his emendations by this criticism; he was not that sort of man. It appears to me that in his emendations, Jerome, and perhaps also Pope Damasus who commissioned him, had in view—all considerations of style tradition laid aside—the adaptation of the linguistic, and especially, word usage, to the Latin of his time. As Jerome himself clearly points out (*Ep.* 106), he is most of all concerned with the *sensus*, the meaning of the words, which he, working on a sound principle, wishes to maintain intact. In view of the fact, however,

that certain modifications had taken place in the evolution of Christian Latin since the second century, some changes were obviously necessary in order to conserve the purity of meaning. When the old words rendered the meaning accurately, these words were preserved. For instance, when there is a general movement to replace the old words *magnificare*, *honorificare*, and *clarificare* by the "European" term *glorificare*, Jerome will have nothing to do with it, because in his opinion the use of the words threatened with extinction does not endanger the original meaning.¹³ In a case like this he refuses to meddle with the old tradition. It is obvious that this adaptation of the texts to the language of his time also compelled Jerome to modify here and there the popular character of the language of the early Bible translations. Nevertheless we may say that Jerome, like Ambrose and Augustine, had a sincere appreciation of the biblical style, and he tries to leave it intact and to maintain it as far as possible. When, for example, in the letter on the *Exultet*—again recognized as being the work of Jerome through the scholarly labors of Dom Morin—he protests with characteristic violence against the style of the *Exultet* in the Easter liturgy because this hymn, with its poetical Classical form, departs from the biblical style which, in the narration of the

Jewish Pasch, was, precisely at Easter, an essential element in the liturgy, he thereby proves that he could feel and appreciate the individual character of the biblical style.¹⁴ He also realizes that there must always be some sort of a bond between biblical and liturgical language. Like St. Augustine, and perhaps even more keenly than he, St. Jerome realized that the language and style of the Bible had their own tradition, which, however, allowed him some latitude. He therefore felt himself justified in making some changes, but was conscious nevertheless that this style had to be respected as a structural unity.

Notwithstanding the criticism originally levelled at the early Bible translations by educated Christians, these versions exercised a profound influence on the further development of Early Christian Latin. Throughout the centuries Early Christian Latin was certainly more marked by the biblical linguistic and stylistic tradition than Greek, which as early as the third century showed a tendency to follow the model of the traditional, literary language. We can also state that Early Christian Latin was more revolutionary than Greek, both in vocabulary and syntactical structure. Whereas Greek renders the greater part of Christian ideas and institutions by already existing words, i.e., uses se-

semantic neologisms, we have already seen how, in Latin, Christian institutions are usually denoted by loanwords. Christian ideas are not only rendered by semantic neologisms but very often by lexicological neologisms, i.e., by new words. How must we explain this difference? In the first place, by the fact that Greek was much further developed than Latin as a language for expressing abstract thought. The language of Latium had always retained something of the concrete rigidity which had originally characterized it as the language of a rural population. Cicero's complaint about the poverty of Latin still held good in later times. Latin thus offered fewer possibilities; it had fewer words for the Christians to build on. Moreover, Western Christianity was more fastidious about the Christian employment of words which had already done service in the pagan religions. This system of avoiding the use of certain words was applied on a much wider scale in Latin than in Greek. Yet one must not forget that Latin sometimes only appears to be more fastidious than Greek. It has, for instance, been pointed out that the Greek Christians did not scruple to adopt the word *σωτήρ* to denote Christ as Savior, although this word played a great role in the pagan religious world, notably in the cult of Aesculapius. The Latins on the contrary re-

fused to adopt the Latin equivalent *conservator* because it retained a pagan significance. They preferred to take refuge in a neologism, *salvator*, derived from *salvare*, equally of Christian coinage, which rendered the Greek *σώζων*. One must remember however that the Septuagint translators had already employed the word *σωτήρ*—at a time admittedly when it was less usual in a religious sense than it became later—and that the Greek Christians undoubtedly took it over on the strength of the Septuagint usage. The Latin *conservator*, however, had never undergone a similar “purification,” so that Latin, in this case, is only more fastidious in appearance.

At the time when Early Christian Latin began to develop, the Christians already formed an extremely closed group, tightly banded together not only by the union of faith but also forced into greater solidarity by persecution. This fact helped to bring it about that Latin formed countless new words which have no specifically Christian content and which we have indicated by the term “indirect Christianisms.” These words include such formations as *cooperari*, *cooperator*, *beneplacitum*, *corruptibilis*, *cervicatus*, *expoliatio*, etc.¹⁵ They prove to what a marked degree the Christians formed a closed group, with their own approach to life. This phenomenon is also found in Early Christian Greek, but the number of

“indirect Christianisms” is smaller there, especially in the later periods.

With regard to the problem with which we are here concerned, namely, the late development of a liturgical Latin language, there is one question of vital importance: the attitude of the originally revolutionary Early Christian Latin towards the literary tradition. We are confronted here with the irrefutable fact that the literary tradition, i.e., the tradition of a polished style based on fixed rules as taught by grammarians and rhetoricians, was very strong among the Romans, as also among the Greeks. For centuries it was scarcely affected by the Christian writers, the translators of the Bible naturally excepted. Notwithstanding all their consciousness of being new and “different,” the Christians only succeeded very slowly, and then only in part, in breaking loose from the Classical literary tradition. In my opinion, this rigid traditionalism is one of the reasons why liturgical Latin developed so late. The moulding of a hieratic language—and from their tradition the Romans were more familiar with the phenomenon of sacral languages than any other people in Antiquity—demands a power of stylistic creation which the first Christian centuries in the West clearly did not possess. If one seeks the reason for the lack of creativity in this particular do-

main, I believe the answer lies in the fact that all the early generations of Christians were educated in the Classical, secular school. They all learnt thus to write according to Classical models and rules. Although life taught them the Christian idiom, the schools had taught them to adopt, on the basis of the spoken word, a literary style of writing which continued to follow the old tradition.

When, at the beginning of the third century, the first Latin Christian literary works came into being, the writers seem to keep automatically to the traditional principles of style. For them the problem at the outset was not how one could create a distinctive Christian style, but rather how far the Christian idiom could be reconciled with the traditional style which was unhesitatingly accepted as the norm. Could one, as a writer, allow himself to employ Christian linguistic elements, or must he avoid them as being non-literary? Several solutions were found for these difficulties. Minucius Felix, for example, in his extremely mannered style, deliberately avoids any Christian linguistic element. On the other hand, Tertullian, without any scruple at all, introduces Christian elements into his dynamic, Asianistic style. Later, too, one will find representatives of both trends, even though neither side will proceed so consistently

as these first two pioneers. St. Cyprian is the first to introduce on a very wide scale the Jewish habit of literal quotations from the Bible. Tertullian, it is true, had not seen any objection to filling most of his works with Biblical quotations, but Cyprian is the first writer in whom we find Scriptural texts continually appearing and often forming the framework of his argument. And this process, which we then find again in practically every Christian writer, imparts to their works, notwithstanding the use of traditional style technique, a completely non-Classical character.

From the beginning of the fourth century onwards Christian writers start theorizing about the problem of a distinctive style. Whereas formerly they had quite simply applied the stylistic processes of the profane literature as they had learnt them in school, they now begin to wonder if, after all, it is a good idea to retain the stylistic tradition of that literature. Or else they ask: What is the sense or function of a polished style? While Cyprian followed the tradition of Tertullian, Lactantius remains faithful to the reserved attitude towards Christian linguistic usage after the manner of writers like Minucius Felix. Lactantius' style is Classical and conservative. He considers the distinction of his style rather as a means of propaganda for

Christianity in the circles of the intellectuals. He is the first to voice the thought that a polished style can be of service in furthering the cause of the propagation of Christianity.¹⁶ Fifty years after Lactantius, St. Hilary of Poitiers similarly makes a plea for a polished traditional style, but his argument is based on completely different considerations. Hilary writes in a traditional, even archaizing style, in which, however, he does not hesitate to employ specifically Christian linguistic elements. He does not share Lactantius' view, according to which an elegant style must be used in order to win over intellectuals to Christianity. Hilary's theory is more profound and based on more spiritual considerations. The Bishop of Poitiers is of the opinion that a beautiful and dignified style gives honor to God. Thus, in his *Tractatus in Psalmos* 13.1, he says that reverence for the word of God which he is expounding impels him to pay attention to his style. For, he reasons, God is, after all, the author of the Scriptures, and the exegete can be considered as the herald of God's word. Accordingly he himself must, by his style, show honor to God, whose message he is proclaiming. Turning to another image, he says that the Christian writer is, as it were, the instrument of God and as such may not allow himself to be *terre à terre*. It is this con-

sideration which leads Hilary to aim at a sort of hieratic style.¹⁷ Thus we see how the way is gradually being paved for the birth of a sacral language for use in the liturgy.

It is in the second half of the fourth century that Rome proceeds to a complete Latinization of the liturgy, even of the eucharistic liturgy. The date of the definite shift from a Greek to a Latin eucharistic liturgy is usually based on a text of Marius Victorinus, who in his *Adversus Arianos* 2.8, written about the year 360, still gives a Greek quotation from the Roman Canon of the eucharistic liturgy, and on the *Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, written by an unknown author between 374 and 382, in which a Latin text from the same liturgy is cited. It seems justifiable to conclude, on the basis of these facts, that the Roman eucharistic liturgy was Latinized between the years 360 and 382. One must not however imagine that this process took place all at once. Undoubtedly, the Latin liturgy was gradually introduced in the already numerous churches in Rome, and during the transition period the liturgy was probably celebrated both in Greek and Latin.¹⁸

In an important article in which he deals with the introduction of Latin into the Roman liturgy, Professor T. Klauser raises the question why this Latinizing process took place so late.¹⁹ He then

draws attention to the conservative character of every liturgy and of the Roman liturgy in particular. From time immemorial the Romans had been accustomed to a very archaic cult form in which the prayer texts had sometimes become incomprehensible even for the priests who had to pronounce them. This is the case, for example, in the prayer formula of the augurs so penetratingly studied by E. Norden, or in the hymn of the Arval Brethren.²⁰ It is therefore understandable that Greek should have been readily accepted in Rome as the liturgical language, even at a time when the knowledge of Greek was decreasing rapidly. Klauser points out further that a hankering after the mysterious was an extremely widespread phenomenon at this period and that the people who had rejected the pagan mysteries in favor of Christianity were probably quite happy to accept this foreign and, to some, incomprehensible language. I think that to this we can add another important factor. The Romans had inherited from their past a strong feeling for style as expressed in their religion and, in fact, on every public occasion. Perhaps their feeling for tradition, for sacred tradition, too, and undoubtedly as far as language was concerned, was stronger than that of the Greeks. As long as the Early Christian idiom had not reached its full development, as

long as men still sought to achieve a dignified form such as we find in Lactantius, and especially in someone like St. Hilary, the time was not yet ripe, the means did not yet exist, for creating a hieratic style. We shall even see that, when a specifically sacral style for the Roman liturgy is in the process of being created, people will draw on the ancient Roman sacral tradition as a source for certain style forms. This, however, was not possible until some time after the Peace of the Church, when the complex which for centuries had made the Christians chary of using anything which reminded them even faintly of the pagan religions had gradually disappeared.

We may sum up in this manner: The whole development of language and style and the changed attitude of the Christians towards the pagan culture helped to make it possible for a liturgical language to arise in the second half of the fourth century. Klauser points out that, while there were many factors which seemed to militate against the introduction of Latin into the liturgy, yet the circumstances prevailing after the Peace of the Church made this more or less a necessity. He has in mind the spacious churches and the crowds of faithful whose attention it would be difficult to retain if an incomprehensible language continued to be employed. In this connection I should like, however, to

point out that part of the liturgy, notably the lessons and the sermon, undoubtedly had already been conducted in the vernacular at an earlier date. The Psalms had probably been sung in Latin very early, as is attested by the existence of early translations. All this does not mean that Professor Klauser is wrong in saying that, with the disappearance of the intimacy of the small Christian communities, the linguistic problem with regard to the liturgy grew more acute.

In the article mentioned, Klauser also expresses his surprise that the transition to liturgical Latin evidently took place so smoothly. According to him one would have expected a lively discussion between supporters and opponents of this measure, and he is surprised that little or no trace can be found in our texts of this *choc des opinions*. I do not know whether Klauser here is not letting himself be too much influenced by our modern conditions and mentality, in other words, by our heated discussions on the introduction of the vernacular into the liturgy. As has already been said, everything indicates that this transition took place very gradually and was thus not as spectacular as we perhaps imagine.

Klauser thinks, nevertheless, that he has found an echo of the struggle in the commentary of Ambrosiaster on 1 Cor. 14, a text which I have already mentioned, and which later is constantly

used as a witness regarding the use of a liturgical language both during the Reformation and, in reaction, at the Council of Trent.²¹ I certainly believe that in this difficult passage we can find an echo of the discussions on the problem of the liturgical language. I cannot, however, agree with Klauser's exposition in its entirety, and I am inclined to think that the ideas of Ambrosiaster are much more subtle than he imagines. In my opinion it is true that in the words, *linguis* (*lingua*) *loqui*, Ambrosiaster repeatedly refers to prayer in a foreign language, but this is by no means the case everywhere in his argument. He is still conscious that St. Paul is really dealing with the "gift of tongues." On the other hand, the word *prophetare* seems always to refer to the interpretation of the Scriptures. It is clear that Ambrosiaster, who from his whole exposition appears to be a sober, practical person, supports the use of Latin in the liturgy and therefore tries to interpret St. Paul's words in a manner which is not entirely in keeping with the latter's intentions. One even gets the impression that he deliberately juggles with the expression *linguis loqui*, which he almost imperceptibly replaces by *lingua loqui quam nescit*. But notwithstanding this rather tendentious exegesis, he makes several remarks which give proof of an extraordinary perspicacity and which are extremely interesting

in the framework of our discussion. He clearly felt, and formulated in his own manner, the idea that language in the liturgy is not only communication but also expression. We see this in his commentary on St. Paul's words in 1 Cor. 14.14. I quote here in Latin in order to keep the connection with the wording of our author: *nam si oravero lingua, spiritus meus orat, mens autem mea sine fructu est*: "If I use a strange tongue when I offer prayer, my spirit is praying, but my mind reaps no advantage from it." He comments: *manifestum est ignorare animum nostrum, si lingua loquatur quam nescit, sicut adsolent Latini homines Graece cantare, oblectati sono verborum nescientes tamen quid dicant. Spiritus autem qui datur in baptismo, scit quid oret animus, dum loquitur, aut perorat lingua sibi ignota: mens autem qui est animus, sine fructu est. Quem enim potest habere fructum, qui ignorat quae loquatur?* This means, generally speaking, that he distinguishes between a spiritual and an intellectual value in prayer. He makes the distinction between the *mens qui est animus* and the *spiritus qui datur in baptismo* (sc. *nobis*). Since we have been baptized and have thereby entered the life of the spirit, our spirit is able to pray without the mind (in the natural sense) reaping any advantage from it. He means by this that prayer, as the expression of a Christian soul, can do with-

out the communication of the human word. He returns to this idea in connection with verse 15: *Hoc dicit quia cum quis hac lingua loquitur, quam novit, tam spiritu quam mente orat: quia non solum spiritus eius quem dixi datum in baptismo scit quid oretur: sed etiam animus simili modo et de psalmo non ignorat.* Anyone praying in a familiar tongue, prays with both spirit and mind; but whenever he prays in a foreign tongue, the spirit, given to him at baptism, still knows what he is praying. We could say, in other words, that the spiritual value of a Christian's prayer is not dependent on its intellectual value. With this exposition Ambrosiaster has touched on the essential problem of the phenomenon of a foreign traditional liturgical language, which really turns on the conflict between religious expression and communication. Thus, Ambrosiaster's ideas go deeper than Professor Klauser suspected. We have here a man who indeed advocates the use of Latin, but not without having deeply considered the problems attached to the use of a liturgical language, nor without having put in a plea for the rights of a foreign sacral language.

Furthermore, Ambrosiaster advances an additional argument dictated by the circumstances prevailing at his time, which also appears to me extremely interesting. Here too he takes as his theme a phrase of St. Paul, 1 Cor. 14.24-25, and

argues that the use of a foreign language might give non-Christians the impression that the Christian liturgy is a sort of mystery cult, whereas the use of the native tongue will clearly show that the religion concerned is an open religion without mystery, and has nothing to hide: *cum enim* (sc. *idiota*) *intellegit et intellegitur, audiens laudare Deum et adorari Christum, pervidet veram esse et venerandam religionem, in qua nihil fucatum, nihil in tenebris videt geri, sicut apud paganos, quibus velantur oculi, ne quae sacra vocant perspicientes, variis se vanitatibus cernant illudi. Omnis enim impostura tenebras petit, et falsa pro veris ostendit: ideo apud nos nihil astute, nihil sub velamine: sed simpliciter unus laudatur Deus.* The allusion to the pagan mysteries (*sacra*) is quite clear. In contrast, the use of the native language in the liturgy would clearly prove that *nihil fucatum*, "nothing is dressed up," *nihil in tenebris* (*videt*) *geri*, "nothing is enacted there in a sort of (mysterious) obscurity." There is no question of hoodwinking the faithful, as in the mysteries. There is no trickery, *nihil astute*, no mystery, *nihil sub velamine*, but the One God is worshipped in all simplicity. This, it is clear, is an argument closely bound up with the times: the fear that Christianity will be taken for a mystery religion. But this remark gives us an unintentional insight into the attitude of such a

sober individual as Ambrosiaster—yet one who certainly fathomed the spiritual depths of prayer and prayer form—towards the forms of the mystery cults from which, according to some modern scholars, the Christian liturgy is supposed to have borrowed its *eidos*, or with which its *eidos* is supposed to show a certain resemblance. Ambrosiaster emphatically combats every such opinion. Even if some parallelism should exist in the form, he sees only antithesis.

As I have already remarked, this argument is closely bound up with conditions prevailing at the time. The essential problem lies in the conflict between expression and communication, a problem whose existence was recognized by Ambrosiaster and which has always existed. And this problem proceeds from the very essence of the liturgy, since it is directed to Him to Whom no human word can do justice, but Who nevertheless wishes to be approached and honored through the medium of human speech, as St. Augustine has so strikingly expressed it: *et tamen Deus, cum de illo nihil digni dici posset, admisit humanæ vocis obsequium, et verbis nostris in laude sua gaudere nos voluit*: “and yet God, although it is impossible for us to say anything that might be worthy of Him, has permitted the homage of the human tongue, and desired that we might find joy in our words spoken in His praise.”²²

But this consciousness, so strikingly formulated by Augustine in this passage, of the impotence, yet, at the same time, of the dignity, of the human word accepted by God as *obsequium*, demands a form which, in some way or other, rises far above the language of everyday life. The manner in which the Church of Rome attempted to attain this ideal in her liturgy will form the subject of the last of these lectures.

General Characteristics of Liturgical Latin

IF WE WISH now to make a somewhat closer examination of the linguistic and stylistic form of the Latin liturgy, we must bear two things in mind.

In the first place, Latin used in the liturgy displays a sacral style. The basis and starting point of Liturgical Latin is the Early Christian idiom, which, however, through the use of features of style drawn from the Early Roman sacral tradition mingled with biblical stylistic elements, has taken on a strongly hieratic character, widely removed from the Christian colloquial language. In this liturgical Latin the requirements demanded by Hilary for the style of the Christian exegete are realized to the full: *Non enim secundum sermonis nostri usum promiscuam in his oportet esse facilitatem*: "There is no place here for the loose facility of the colloquial language" (*In Ps.* 13.1). The advocates of the use of the vernacular in the liturgy who maintain that even

in Christian Antiquity the current speech of everyday life, "the Latin of the common man," was employed, are far off the mark. Liturgical Latin is not Classical Latin, but neither is it, as is so often said, the Latin which was considered decadent by educated people.¹ The earliest liturgical Latin is a strongly stylized, more or less artificial language, of which many elements—for instance the Orations—were not easily understood even by the average Christian of the fifth century or later. This language was far removed from that of everyday life, a fact which was certainly appreciated, since, at the time, people still retained the *sens du sacré*.²

In the second place, we must postulate that this stylization differs in different parts of the liturgy. The style of the Canon for example differs notably from that of the Orations, and the Prefaces too show a distinctive, traditional, type of style. The rare poetic element, insofar as it is not biblical, has likewise its own style. May I remark at this point that the Canon of the Mass, the most sacred part of the liturgy, is also the most strongly and rigidly stylized. This style differs noticeably from that of the Collects and Prefaces, which continued for a long time to be improvised or at least repeatedly composed anew. For in these parts of the liturgy the continual creation of new prayer texts led to the

development of a number of formulas and fixed expressions and also of stylistic patterns from which new yet familiar-sounding prayers could be constructed over and again.

Let us begin by casting a glance at the style of the Roman Canon of the Mass. Here we must bear in mind that originally, even for the central part of the Eucharistic Liturgy, there existed no fixed prayer formula. Justin says for example that in his day the person presiding over the liturgical gathering improvised the eucharistic prayer (*Apol.* 1.65-67). Hippolytus of Rome, who gives us a text for the Eucharistic Liturgy in his *Apostolica traditio*, clearly gives only a specimen and not a definite text. In his time, too, the celebrating bishop could still improvise the prayers himself within the framework of an already fixed liturgical tradition.³ I have said, "within the framework of a tradition," for at that time there already existed a tradition. While it gave the individual celebrant a certain amount of latitude, its essential elements, however, were henceforth always respected. The service began, according to Jewish tradition, with a thanksgiving, *eucharistia*—the word which gave its name to the whole celebration. This was followed by the account of the institution (whether, and to what extent this account could be limited, in certain Eastern liturgies, to a

reference to the Last Supper, I shall here leave out of consideration)⁴; then came the *anamnesis*, and the *epiklesis*. We already find this outline in Hippolytus who, as we said, has left us a personal composition according to the scheme in use at that time. Here we are still rather far removed from the later Roman Canon.

After Hippolytus, we possess few or no details on the Roman liturgy until the end of the fourth century. Then we find for the first time, in the catechetical sermons of St. Ambrose which form the basis for his treatise *De sacramentis*, parts of a Latin Eucharistic Liturgy: a prayer corresponding to our *Quam oblationem*, the account of the institution, and the *anamnesis*—corresponding to our *Unde et memores*, *Supra quae*, and *Supplices*. This Anaphora is thus not yet identical with the later form which survives in our liturgy, but it is clearly related to it. We might even say that it is a rough model.⁵ After St. Ambrose follows a period of evolution which ends in the time of St. Gregory the Great. The first question which occurs to us regarding St. Ambrose's text and the later Latin Canon concerns the relationship of these Latin texts with the early Greek liturgy of Rome, which, as we saw, although not possessing a definite text, followed a traditional pattern. The exact nature of this relationship escapes us. Everything goes to

show, however, that the Latin Canon was, stylistically, a fairly independent work. While it was inspired by existing Greek prayers, or prayer patterns, its style was nonetheless a typically Roman creation.⁶ As far as this style is concerned, we can clearly distinguish two stages. The first we find in St. Ambrose, where the typical stylistic features of the later Canon are beginning to emerge, but these are only consistently applied and reach their full development in the second stage.⁷

But before proceeding further let us consider the question, whether the Canon, as found in the *De sacramentis*, can be regarded as Roman. In his article in the *Miscellanea Mercati* which has already been quoted, Professor Klauser expresses the opinion that the early Latin form of the Canon, as found in the *De sacramentis*, is probably the work of St. Ambrose himself.⁸ He bases his theory on the use of *rationabilis* in the Canon of the *De sacramentis*. Klauser refers to a series of studies by Dom Odo Casel, who has proved that *rationabilis* here has the meaning of *spiritalis*, and that the word characterizes the Eucharistic offering as a spiritual sacrifice, differing essentially from material sacrifices.⁹ Seeing that Casel further thinks that this use of *rationabilis* is especially frequent in St. Ambrose's works, Klauser feels that there is a possi-

bility of this Canon text being Ambrose's own creation. We should then be confronted with the remarkable fact that the immediate precursor of the Roman Canon originated in Milan. I do not think that this thesis is tenable. I believe that I have shown, in a study on *logikos-rationabilis*, that St. Ambrose's use of *rationabilis* differs greatly from that in the Canon. The latter is directly based on the New Testament use of the word. This fact, in my opinion, disposes of the argument in favor of Ambrosian authorship, and it would perhaps be the most sensible course, for the time being, to accept as the most likely theory that the Canon of the *De sacramentis* is of Roman origin.¹⁰

By the time of St. Gregory the Great, the Canon—still the only fixed part of the Eucharistic Liturgy—had received a form which closely resembles that in use at the present day. This Pope made a few more, unimportant modifications, and it was the Canon as standardized by him which now passed into general use in the Western Church during the coming centuries.¹¹

If we compare the older prayers from the *De sacramentis* with the later forms handed down in the *Sacramentarium Gelasianum* and the *Sacramentarium Gregorianum*, we notice that these later forms, which except for a few unimportant details are the same as those of our present text,

differ from the earlier ones in showing a marked inclination to accumulate words with roughly the same meaning, and, in general, to give the early texts a more cumbrous, solemn wording. On examining these stylistic changes more closely, one can distinguish two main groups.¹²

In the first place, the paratactical construction of the early text has been replaced in the later prayer texts by a relative clause or an ablative absolute. For example, the early text has: *Fac nobis hanc oblationem adscriptam*, etc.; the later: *Quam oblationem tu, Deus, in omnibus, quaesumus, benedictam . . . facere digneris*. Or again, in the early text: *Qui pridie quam pateretur in sanctis manibus suis accepit panem, respexit in caelum ad te*; in the later: *qui pridie quam pateretur accepit panem in sanctas ac venerabiles manus suas, elevatis oculis in caelum*, etc. Here the later, definitive redaction has replaced the more popular, looser constructions by the more rigid constructions of the cultural language.

The second category of changes is much more interesting. This consists of a tendency to employ more words, an endeavor to heap up series of consecutive synonyms. Here we meet a characteristic trait of the Roman liturgy, the first symptoms of which can already be seen in the language of the Canon of the *De sacramentis*, but which now comes much more strongly to the

fore. In addition, this wealth of words has often a juridical-sacral character. One finds expressions in the *Te igitur* like: *Supplices rogamus et petimus; haec dona, haec munera, haec sancta sacrificia illibata; quam pacificare, custodire et regere digneris*. The formulas are balanced by a sustained parallelism. Thus, for example, the old formula: *hunc panem sanctum et calicem vitae aeternae*, becomes the more harmonious: *panem sanctum vitae aeternae et calicem salutis perpetuae*, of which the second part is a liturgical reflection (*calicem salutaris*) of Ps. 115.13. It is a noteworthy proof of the great influence of this stylization that even the fragmentary biblical quotations, which usually keep their original form in patristic literature, are, in the Canon, adapted to suit the special style of these prayers. So, for example, the alliterating formula, *de tuis donis ac datis*, is clearly suggested by 1 Par. 29.14 in the Vulgate, but this idea is reproduced here in a form which is typically Roman in structure.

The vocabulary of the Canon, which, generally speaking, bears a strong Christian and biblical imprint, shows a number of juridical elements, as for example, in the enumeration: *benedictam, adscriptam, ratam, rationabilem, acceptabilemque*.

This rhythmically balanced flow of words, which shows an almost juridical precision, was however, as a stylistic device, not an innovation

of the Christian prayer. We already come across this same sacral style in the primitive pagan prayers of the Roman national religion. This monumental verbosity coupled with juridical precision, which is so well suited to the *gravitas Romana* but which also betrays a certain scrupulosity with regard to higher powers, was the typical form of expression of the old Roman prayer. It will suffice to quote one or two of these Early Roman prayer texts. Cato (*De agricultura* 141.2) has preserved for us an old Roman prayer for the lustration of the fields. I shall quote a fragment of it here:

*uti tu morbos visos invisosque
viduertatem vastitudinemque
calamitates intemperiasque
prohibeas defendas averruncesque.*

Macrobius (*Saturn.* 3.9.7) gives us the text of a prayer by which the Romans attempted to persuade the gods of an enemy city to desert it:

*precor veneror veniamque a vobis peto
ut vos [hunc] populum civitatemque . . . deseratis
loca templa sacra urbemque eorum relinquatis
absque his abeatis . . .*

On this point there can be no doubt. In these primitive Roman prayer texts one finds the same stylistic peculiarities as in the prayers of our Canon: the same wealth of words, the same parallelism, alliteration, and rhyme, the same

juridical precision. One can say that the same processes of style found in the old Roman prayers, processes which betray a typically Roman mentality, have been applied, to a certain degree, to the Christian prayer. A sacral style has been created which links up with the old Roman prayer of the official Roman cult which had survived throughout the centuries more as a *decorum* of the Empire than as a religious element, and which the Emperor Augustus had tried to revive. This style had become, as it were, the symbol of Roman dignity, and as such it influenced the Christian tradition. On the other hand the Roman liturgy did not adopt any elements at all from the Eastern cults. Roman sobriety deliberately avoided the exuberance of certain eastern prayer-styles which actually exerted an influence on Christian liturgy in the East.¹³

We are here concerned, as I have just indicated, not with linguistic features, nor with vocabulary, but exclusively with processes of style. The former follow, without exception, the Christian and, above all, the biblical tradition. Thus we see that, in the style of the Canon of the Mass, the Roman liturgy has created something very special and unique: a remarkable combination of *Romanitas* and *Christianitas* which throughout the centuries will remain its chief

characteristic. We might say that the Roman Canon forms a closed stylistic bloc, about which are grouped other more mobile and less ponderously hieratic elements.

The prayer with which the Canon originally began, but which was later no longer considered as forming part of it, i.e., the Preface, belongs to the group of prayers which continued for a long time to be improvised or composed anew again and again. The limited number of Prefaces which have taken the place of the early profusion, and which originated at different periods, still clearly show a distinctive style. The dialogue between celebrant and congregation which introduces the Preface and which perpetuates old Hellenistic acclamation elements, belonged from the earliest times, in both East and West, to the more spectacular features of the Eucharistic Liturgy. This was not only because it formed the introduction to the eucharistic prayers proper but also because at this point the congregation also shared in the liturgy. That this dialogue occupied an important place in the liturgical consciousness of the faithful, appears from the fact that the early Christian preachers allude to it again and again. This is attested for the West already from the time of Cyprian.¹⁴

The tradition of the Preface is, as it were, automatically on the biblical plane, for it fore-

shadowed our participation in the song of the heavenly liturgy, as St. Cyril of Jerusalem so strikingly puts it: "For this cause we rehearse this confession of God, delivered down to us from the Seraphim, that we may join in hymns with the hosts of the world above" (*Myst. cat.* 5.6). The Preface is linked with the Jewish tradition of the table-thanksgiving, probably connected with recollections of the sabbath morning service in the synagogue. We can thus understand the combination of the praise and thanksgiving elements which led almost automatically to the lofty, partly psalmodic-lyric, and partly theologically demonstrative style of the Roman Prefaces.¹⁵ I must, however, remark here that, with the custom of improvisation in the West, elements inspired by contemporary circumstances, even personal elements, which as yet had little connection with the old idea of praise and thanksgiving, repeatedly crept in.¹⁶ The remnants of this tradition can be clearly seen in the countless Prefaces of the *Sacramentarium Leonianum*, which depart from the old tradition in many respects. Yet a reaction against this exuberance soon set in and a return was made to an earlier tradition. Thus, apart from this temporary eclipse of the old prayer style and content, we can say that the Roman Preface usually shows none of the exuberance of certain early

Eastern types, with their hymn in praise of the creation—types going back to a Jewish tradition, but that, as a prayer of thanksgiving in a more austere form, it concentrates particularly on God's plan of salvation. As a result, there is a certain fondness for abstract diction which usually follows the line of biblical tradition and, at the same time, exhibits a certain oratorical tendency. This abstract diction is here again coupled with a sustained parallelism, which now follows the style of psalmic parallelism and now resembles more closely the structure of the old Roman prayers. But however one regards in detail the structure of the old Prefaces, one retains the general impression of an admittedly solemn and hieratic style, yet a style which is more emotional than that of the Canon. A sentence like:

Qui corporali ieunio
vitia comprimis
mentem elevas
virtutem largiris
et praemia,

displays a rhythmical mobility and sensibility which differs from the monumental style of the Canon prayers. On the other hand the antithetical construction of a sentence like:

Qui mortem nostram moriendo destruxit
et vitam resurgendo reparavit,

closely resembles the antithetically balanced cola of the Canon. But the rhetorical element is not lacking either:

Quia, cum Unigenitus tuus
in substantia nostrae mortalitatis apparuit
nova nos immortalitatis suae luce reparavit.

It is clear from this short analysis that the style of the Prefaces is less homogeneous than that of the Canon. This results partly from the long tradition of improvisation of this prayer form and partly from the transition from the ancient theme of the hymn of praise on the creation to a more contemplative, dogmatically and theologically orientated hymn of praise and thanksgiving on the divine plan of salvation. Thus, in some of the Roman Prefaces, the traditional introduction to the *trishagion* at the end of the Preface, contrasts, even in style, with the reflections preceding it.

The Roman Orations form a much more closely knit stylistic unity. Father Jungmann has rightly pointed out that the Orations pronounced by the celebrant during the eucharistic ceremony accentuate three crowning points in the liturgical act: the Introit, the Offertory, and the Communion are each emphasized by a prayer spoken aloud, and pronounced by the celebrant in the name of the people, in a form which goes back to the early tradition of improvisation.¹⁷ It

is not by chance that the Roman liturgy denotes precisely these prayers by the ancient word *oratio*, the term for prayer in the earliest Christian colloquial language. In the liturgical prayer texts themselves this old word has been constantly replaced by *preces*, a term which in the earliest times was avoided by the Christian current speech as retaining a pagan flavor, but which later received a new stylistic value as an "archaism." The appellation *oratio* goes back thus to an old tradition in the Christian colloquial language, and I find it difficult to agree with Father Jungmann when he says that the word *oratio* indicates that these prayers have something of the character of a public discourse.¹⁸ Jungmann is thinking here of the Classical meaning of *oratio*, but already in the earliest Christian Latin, *oratio* had become the technical term for Christian prayer as a derivative of *orare* in the Christian sense, "to pray." To me it seems difficult to agree that within the framework of the liturgy the old meaning of *oratio*, "a speech," should have appeared again, all the more so since the introductory *oremus* led almost automatically to the appellation *oratio*, "prayer." Thus, although I do not believe that *oratio* suggests the idea of the Classical *oratio*, it is clear nevertheless that the style of the Roman liturgical *oratio*, as formed by a long tradition, is

more rhetorical than any other part of the Eucharistic Liturgy. While in the Canon the ancient Roman prayer tradition provides stylistic elements, those of the *oratio* go back to the rhetorical tradition of Rome. In the close-knit, well-composed phrases of the Roman Orations, in which the celebrant resumes, as it were, the prayers of the faithful, we find traces of the style processes of the art of polished speech, taught and practiced for centuries in the schools of Rome. And yet the style and structure of the Orations again cannot be explained exclusively by the Roman rhetorical tradition, for it is linked up with ancient euchological patterns. Baumstark has pointed out how, in these prayers, the Jewish prayer of praise is combined with the prayer of petition, just as Christ taught us in the Our Father.¹⁹ The normal structure is this: first an invocation to God, then a glorification in the form of a relative or participial clause, and lastly the prayer of petition. A simpler form omits the laudatory element and is restricted to an invocation and a request, often qualified by a final clause.²⁰

The first, more developed type, is usually extremely well-balanced rhythmically, as, for example, in:

Deus qui humanae substantiae dignitatem
et mirabiliter condidisti

et mirabilius reformasti,
da quaesumus nobis
eius divinitatis esse consortes
qui humanitatis nostrae fieri dignatus est particeps
(*Sacramentarium Leonianum*, Feltoe p. 159);

or, again, in:

Deus qui omnipotentiam tuam
parcendo maxime et miserando manifestas;
multiplica super nos misericordiam tuam;
ut, ad tua promissa currentes,
caelestium bonorum facias esse consortes. (Dom. X
post Pentecosten).

Rheinfelder has pointed out that this structure, which consists of an invocation followed by a relative clause, was extremely common in the early Roman prayers and gives as an example a Roman prayer text such as that in Livy 29.27.1:

Divi divaeque, qui maria terrasque colitis,
vos precor quaesoque uti . . .

In my opinion, however, we are here concerned with a very widespread, almost general, human euchological form which is to be found, among other places, in the Greek epic. See, e. g., *Iliad* 1.451: κλύθι μεν, ἀργυρότοξ', ὅς Χρῦσῃν ἀμφιβέβηκας. The simple oration form without the relative clause also shows a very well-balanced rhythmical construction, as in:

Omnipotens sempiterne Deus,
da nobis fidei, spei et caritatis augmentum:

et, ut mereamur assequi quod promittis,
fac nos amare quod praecipis. (Dom. XIII post
Pentecosten).

The hieratic character of the oration style is accentuated by the use of traditional prayer terms, such as *quaesumus*, *dignari* (derived from the curial style), and also by periphrases with *mereri*, etc. This is coupled with a limited but extremely stylized vocabulary which, with typical purism, rejects the countless loanwords from the Early Christian colloquial language.

Thus we see in the style of the *oratio*, a close-knit, traditional whole which clearly differs both from the style of the Canon and from that of the Prefaces. Rhetorical mobility is one of the most striking characteristics of the Orations, a fact which is very closely bound up with the function of these prayers.

Here I must say something about the poetical part of the liturgy. In the West, as in the East, the Church from the earliest times has assigned a place in her liturgy to the poetic element. The Psalms were undoubtedly the church hymns par excellence, and thus the earliest church songs as well as the New Testament *Cantica*, the *Magnificat* and the *Canticum Zachariae*, follow the tradition of the Psalms. In so doing the ecclesiastical hymn departs from the Classical metrical poetry: the parallelism of the Psalms was not felt in

Antiquity to be poetically binding. The West, too, was familiar with the prose hymns, the so-called *psalmi idiotici*, which were chiefly sung in the non-eucharistic synaxes, and were thus probably already sung in Latin. Yet these prose hymns had little success in the West, with the result that very few of them have been preserved. These hymns, which departed entirely from the norms of Classical metrical poetry, were not very acceptable to a period which sought to establish a closer link with the Classical literary tradition. In this way only a few *chefs d'oeuvre* of this sort of poetry found favor in the eyes of later generations and have thus come down to us. My mind turns, in the first place, to the two great prose hymns, the *Gloria*—the so-called great doxology—and the *Te Deum*. These show how beautiful and impressive this old hymn form could be and how strongly anchored it is in a very ancient Christian tradition.²¹ The rigid, monumental, Roman Eucharistic Liturgy, however, is in general not favorably disposed—with the exception of the Psalms—towards this poetic element. The *Gloria*, an old morning hymn originating in the East, nevertheless slowly obtained a place in the Eucharistic Liturgy. It appears that this hymn, based on the theme of the angelic chorus (Lk. 2.4), was brought to the West by St. Hilary of Poitiers.

In the beginning it was certainly not intended for the Eucharistic Liturgy. However, it was incorporated into it at Rome on special feast days, but at first only when the bishop was the celebrant.²² The *Gloria* does not seem to have gained a place in the Masses of ordinary priests before the later part of the eleventh century. This hymn, indeed, belongs to the songs—and the acclamations—intoned by the celebrant and then taken up by the congregation. In its tripartite form—angelic chorus, praise of God, and prayer to Christ followed by the Trinitarian final chord, it displays a well thought out pattern. Neither this old Greek hymn, however, nor the other very ancient prose hymn which has come down to us, the *Te Deum*, show signs of a Roman inspiration in style such as we find in other parts of the Roman liturgy. The *Gloria*, with its New Testament theme, following the tradition of the Psalms, has its place in the biblically inspired poetry. In its affirmative doxology in the indicative: *Laudamus te . . . gratias agimus tibi propter magnam gloriam tuam*, followed by the prayer to Christ, we find the combination of praise and supplication which we also found in the Orations. Here, however, they are couched in a typically biblical style and wording. This hymn of biblical inspiration, which broke through the sobriety of the Roman liturgy only on special feast days is,

as we have already noted, one of the few remnants of what was undoubtedly an extremely rich collection of prose hymns. Such hymns originated in the spiritual fervor of the first Christian communities but were scarcely suited to the sober character of the later Latin liturgy of Rome. We can also understand in this connection, that for a long time the Roman liturgy adopted a reserved attitude towards the new and more literary form of Christian hymn introduced into the West by St. Ambrose, and likewise of Eastern inspiration. This hymn form, which both in style and metre formed a compromise between the ancient poetical tradition of Roman literature and the Early Christian prose hymns, quickly became popular in the West. It was also to be taken up by Western monasticism in the course of its development. But here again the Roman liturgy continued to stand aloof; the Psalms were regarded as providing a sufficient poetic element. Thus, with its psalmody and lessons on the one hand and its strongly Roman stylized elements on the other, the Roman liturgy achieved a harmonious balance which coming centuries attempted to maintain as far as possible.

A curious poetical piece of prose occupies a completely isolated place in the Roman liturgy. I mean the *Exultet* or *Praeconium paschale*.²³ This

intrinsically poetical text, which combines certain Roman poetic elements borrowed from Vergil's *Georgics* with a strong rhetorical cadence, was admitted very late into the Roman liturgy, not, in fact, before the Carolingian Age. Elsewhere in Italy, however, even as far as the environs of Rome itself, and also in Spain and Gaul this, or a similar text, formed part of the Easter liturgy as early as the fourth century.²⁴ A stylistic analysis of its text makes us realize how much this sublime prayer, originally improvised by the deacon according to a fixed pattern at the blessing of the Pascal candle, differs from the style of the Roman liturgy. We still find the ancient pattern in our present day *Exultet*. The deacon first announced the beginning of the great feast and pronounced the blessing over the Paschal candle. The praise of the bee, chaste and fruitful as the Virgin Mother, which was inspired by Vergil's *Georgics*, was also a required feature. In a letter already mentioned, dating from 384 and which Dom Morin rightly attributes to St. Jerome according to the old tradition, we find very interesting details concerning the history of the blessing of the Paschal candle.²⁵ St. Jerome tells us that not only was the pattern of the *Exultet* already determined, but that also the motif taken from the *Georgics* was more or less obligatory. But it is

even more interesting to note that he is strongly opposed to this literary form, which in his opinion is not at all in keeping with the service of the Easter liturgy. He remarks, with characteristic acerbity, that such rhetorical tours de force may indeed arouse the admiration of the hearers, that the beautifully balanced phrases do indeed flatter the ear, but that he quite fails to see what all this has to do with either the liturgy or with Easter: *Quid ad diaconum, quid ad ecclesiae sacramenta, quid ad tempus Paschae quo agnus occiditur, cum accinctis lumbis carnes cum ossibus devorantur . . . ?*²⁶ He condemns the profane poetical and at the same time unbiblical character of this prayer. As far as the Vergilian contribution is concerned, it is interesting to note that later centuries were as much opposed to it as St. Jerome himself. The praise of the bee is not found in the tenth-century Pontifical of Mayence, and when, at the beginning of the thirteenth century, Pope Innocent III revised the liturgy of the Curia, he decided to omit this part entirely.²⁷

If, however, we study the text of the *Exultet* more closely from a stylistic point of view, we find that the whole style of this prayer is influenced by Classical poetry. In this sublime hymn, of which Paul Claudel has said that the most exalted verses of Sophocles or Pindar ap-

pear to him dull and insipid by comparison²⁸ (Clausel is speaking of the present form of the *Exultet* which no longer includes the praise of the bee), we find a poetical-rhetorical style which does indeed offer a sharp contrast to the sober, severe, style of the Roman liturgy. It is partly this very contrast which enables this hymn, sung on Easter Eve, to accentuate, even for modern congregations, the unique quality of the Easter celebration, the pivot of the whole liturgical year.

It is not my task, after this general analysis of Liturgical Latin, to answer here the question of how far this Latin form of our liturgy is still viable in our times. I should only like to formulate, as a sort of résumé and conclusion, a few thoughts which directly proceed from the considerations I have put before you.

Liturgical Latin, as constituted towards the end of Christian Antiquity and preserved unchanged—in its main lines at least—down to the present time, is a deliberately sacral stylization of Early Christian Latin as it gradually developed in the Christian communities of the West. The Latin Christians were comparatively late in creating a liturgical language. When they did so, the Christian idiom had already reached full

maturity and circumstances rendered it possible to draw, for purposes of style, on the ancient sacral heritage of Rome. This would have been impossible during the first centuries, given the original repugnance to anything connected with paganism.

This linguistic and stylistic form, which was more or less artificial and which, partly as a result of a long tradition of improvisation and free composition, possessed a large number of traditional forms and formulas, was certainly not easy for the average Christian of late Antiquity to understand. To this extent, the present situation, i.e., the fact that the liturgical language is not understood by a large section of the faithful, is not entirely new. We must bear in mind, however, that we have technical means of reducing the inconvenience of an "incomprehensible" language to a minimum which Christian Antiquity and the Middle Ages did not possess. It is true that the Middle Ages utilized the language of images, as we see it expressed over the entrances to churches, along walls, on capitals of columns, and in the stained glass windows of cathedrals, in order to initiate the illiterate into the mysteries of faith and the liturgy. But we command the printed word which, in the form of translations into the vernacular, can render the liturgical texts more easy to under-

stand, even though this must still be supplemented by the sermon.

Furthermore, in the liturgy, we must make a distinction between the purely prayer texts, those destined to be read—the Epistle and Gospel, and the confessional texts—the *Credo*. This distinction was already current in Christian Antiquity. In the purely prayer texts we are concerned with expressional forms; in the others, primarily with forms of communication. It is these latter, in my opinion, which especially need to be formulated in the vernacular. Even at the time when the liturgy in the West was still celebrated in Greek, it apparently became customary to translate the second kind of texts into Latin.

As regards the plea which we so often here for vernacular versions of the prayer texts, I think, from a purely theoretical point of view—and I am here dealing only with theoretical considerations—that we are justified in asking whether, at the present time, the introduction of the vernacular into the liturgy would not mean more loss than gain. First and foremost there is the question, which, as we have seen, also troubled the first centuries, whether or not the vernacular would be suitable for the composition of a sacral prayer style. As I have pointed out, the early Christian West waited a long time before adopting the use of Latin. It waited until the Chris-

tian language possessed the resources necessary to create an official, ecclesiastical prayer language. If we confine ourselves to the modern, so-called Western languages, we are obliged to note that all of them are now striving for a greater degree of efficiency. In the first of these lectures I spoke of this general tendency, one that was commented upon by Otto Jespersen twenty years ago and has been definitely established by modern linguists.²⁹ There is no doubt that this development furthers the efficiency of our languages as media of communication in daily life, but at the same time it renders them less suitable for sacral stylization. And yet we must realize that sacral stylization forms an essential element of every official prayer language and that this sacral, hieratic character cannot, and should never, be relinquished. From the point of view of the general development of the Western languages—to say nothing of the problems raised by other languages—the present time is certainly not propitious for the abandonment of Latin.

But even if a solution could be found for this problem of the sacral language of the liturgy, the question would still remain whether the gain would outweigh the loss. When Antiquity came to an end and new peoples with new languages adopted Christianity, the Western Church not only retained Latin as the language of her re-

ligious ceremonies but also used it as the instrument for the transmission of culture to the young Germanic peoples. This made possible a living continuity with Christian Antiquity, with that world in which the historical facts of the Redemption and the first preaching took place and with which Christianity and the Christians themselves, whether they will or no, in whatever part of the world they may live and whatever language they may speak, are, and must remain, connected. For Christianity is not a timeless myth, but is founded on an historical fact, localized in time and history. Latin is thus a *vinculum unitatis*, not only horizontally but vertically, and Liturgical Latin is like a living element of the Church which makes possible the survival of this vertical link. One might express this idea in a simpler and more concrete fashion. If the liturgy were to be celebrated entirely in the vernaculars of the various countries, and the prayers of the Breviary said by each one in his own tongue, the Latin of the Church would automatically die out and our last links with the ancient sources would be irrevocably severed. Scholars would certainly continue to study the writings of the first centuries, but where scholars alone establish a tradition, there is no culture, no spirituality. The soil of scholarship alone is not sufficient to nourish a living plant.

I do not mean to speak of the horizontal band, the *vinculum unitatis*, which binds the numerous peoples of Mother Church in the liturgy by the use of one language. This argument is commonly dismissed as "sentimental." But it does not seem to me sentimental to remark that in our time there exists throughout the whole world a movement whose aim is to bring the peoples closer together, to abolish frontiers. Is it not remarkable, then, that precisely at this time we should wish to cast off a *vinculum unitatis* which has existed for fifteen centuries?

But all this lies more in the practical sphere, with which we are not concerned at present. May I therefore in conclusion say something of the function, considered purely from a linguistic and psychological point of view, of a liturgical language such as Latin.

For this I must return to what I said in the beginning, i.e., that the language used in the prayers of the Church, in which the individual believer takes part, lies not so much in the realm of communication as in that of expression. The most important factor here is the spirit (Ambrosiaster speaks of the spirit which we receive in baptism), that spirit which, in the unity of the *ecclesia*, a unity called *pax* by the first centuries, turns towards God.³⁰ In addition, the individual can, and must, have his own, personal communi-

cation with God. Now it has always been the desire of the Western Church that language, as the religious expression of the Church, should reflect as far as possible the unity of the mystical body of Christ. To this end she demands a certain loosening of the bond of the concrete human word as a medium of communication. She probably wished thereby to counteract to some degree the excessive attachment to literature and literary forms of Western man who for centuries lived in a typically literary culture. This at least was the impression of St. Augustine, who from his youth until the day of his death was unable to free himself from traces of the rhetorical tradition of his times. There is no doubt that Augustine was fully conscious of the value of personal prayer, formulated if necessary in plain words. And yet, in his opinion, man, in his contact with God, must also learn to free himself from dependence on the personal linguistic expression of words as such, so that all may praise the One God together and as one, thus anticipating what will later come to pass in the heavenly liturgy. At the end of his great work, *De trinitate*, he formulated these ideas as follows: "Free me O Lord from the excess of words that torments my soul, which is wretched in Thy sight and which casts itself upon Thy mercy. For even in thought I am not silent, even when my words

are hushed.” (Here we find again our original problem of the relationship between thought and speech.) And he continues: “Thou knowest that many of my thoughts are human thoughts, for they are vain (Ps. 93.11). Grant that I may not succumb to them . . . that I may not, as it were, be lulled to sleep by them . . . For, when once we have reached Thee, then all that outpouring of words which we utter without reaching Thee will be at an end . . . and then we shall ceaselessly say but one word, praising Thee with one voice and being made one in Thee.”³¹

As we have already seen, the Church, from the earliest times, has felt herself closely united with the heavenly liturgy, and we may say that she seeks here already, in the form of her liturgy, what Augustine termed “praising Thee with one voice, and being made one in Thee”: *laudantes te in unum, et in te facti unum*³²—an experience which will only be fully realized in the “aeon” to come, but of which we can have a foretaste here on earth.

NOTES

I. SACRED AND HIERATIC LANGUAGES

¹ See Otto Jespersen, *Efficiency in Linguistic Change* (Copenhagen 1941) *passim*.

² Bertrand Russell, *Human Knowledge: Its Scope and Limits* (London 1948) 74; A. W. de Groot, *De moderne taalwetenschap, in het bijzonder in Amerika* (Groningen 1956) 5.

³ Charles Bally, *Linguistique générale et linguistique française* (2nd ed. Berne 1944) 363ff.

⁴ Hugo Schuchardt-Brevier (Halle/Saale 1922) 211; see also B. Terracini, *Guida allo studio della linguistica storica* (Rome 1949) 216.

⁵ See Friedrich Kainz, "Sprachpsychologisches zum Thema Religion und Sprache," *Die Sprache* 1 (1949) 101-115.

⁶ Erich Fascher, *Προφητεία: Eine sprach- und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Giessen 1927) 170.

⁷ H. Brémond, *Histoire littéraire du sentiment religieux en France* X (Paris 1932) 3f.

⁸ P. Salmon, in *Mélanges Bénédictins* (Abbaye S. Wandrille 1947) 55.

⁹ See Karl Meister, *Die homerische Kunstsprache* (Leipzig 1921); Milman Parry, *L'épique traditionnelle dans Homère* (Paris 1928); P. Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique* (2 vols., Paris 1942, 1953); C. J. Ruijgh, *L'élément achéen dans la langue épique* (Assen 1957).

¹⁰ Hermann Güntert, *Von der Sprache der Götter und Geister* (Halle/Saale 1921) 104ff.

¹¹ Chr. Mohrmann, "Notes sur le latin liturgique," *Irenikon* 25 (1952) 17.

¹² Theodor Klauser, "Der Übergang der römischen Kirche von der griechischen zur lateinischen Liturgiesprache," *Miscellanea G. Mercati* 1 (Studi e testi 121; Vatican City 1946) 467-482; Chr. Mohrmann, "Les origines de la latinité chrétienne à Rome," *Vigiliae Christianae* 3 (1949) 67-106, 163-183.

¹³ A. Baumstark - B. Botte, *Liturgie comparée* (3rd ed. Chevetogne 1953) 57, think that the words of 1 Clem. 34.6 indicate that in the West, and particularly in Rome, the quotation from Isaiah played a role in the liturgy from an extremely early date. W. C. van Unnik, "1 Clement 34 and the Sanctus," *Vigiliae Christianae* 5 (1951) 204-248, denies however that this passage contains any allusion to the liturgy.

¹⁴ G. Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London 1952) 197.

Liturgical Latin—Its Origins and Character

¹⁸ And yet, in my opinion, L. Sanders, *L'Hellénisme de saint Clement de Rome et le Paulinisme* (Louvain 1943), exaggerates the extent of Stoic influence on 1 Clem.

¹⁹ Fr. Overbeck, in *Historische Zeitschrift* N.F. 12 (1882) 417ff.—Ed. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa* II (Leipzig and Berlin 1909) 479ff.

²⁰ Ed. Norden, *Agnostos Theos* (2nd ed. Leipzig and Berlin 1929) 355ff.

²¹ Chr. Mohrmann, "Les emprunts grecs dans la latinité chrétienne," *Vigiliae Christianae* 4 (1950) 206ff.

²² G. Kittel, *Lexicographia sacra* (*Theology, Occasional Papers* 7; London 1938) 15f.

²³ See also Gal. 4.6.

²⁴ A. Deissmann, *Die Urgeschichte des Christentums im Lichte der Sprachforschung* (Tübingen 1910) 12ff.

²⁵ Karl Prümm, *Christentum als Neuheitserlebnis* (Freiburg im Br. 1939) 457ff.

²⁶ Franz Joseph Dölger, *Sol salutis* (2nd ed. Münster in W. 1925) 198ff.

²⁷ See Dölger, *ibid.* 200.

²⁸ A. J. Vermeulen, *The Semantic Development of Gloria in Early Christian Latin* (*Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva* 12; Nijmegen 1956) 17f.

²⁹ See O. Cullmann, *Urchristentum und Gottesdienst* (3rd ed. Zurich 1956) 18.

³⁰ Baumstark-Botte, *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 13) 72.

³¹ J. A. Jungmann, *Missarum sollemnia* (Vienna 1948) I 39f.: English translation (by F. A. Brunner), *The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origins and Development* I (New York etc. 1951) 29f.

³² Baumstark-Botte 73.

³³ *Ibid.* 75.

II. EARLY CHRISTIAN LATIN AND THE ORIGINS OF LITURGICAL LATIN

¹ See Gustave Bardy, *La question des langues dans l'Eglise ancienne* I (Paris 1948) *passim*; Chr. Mohrmann, "Linguistic Problems in the Early Christian Church," *Vigiliae Christianae* 11 (1957) 11-36.

² Carl Schneider, *Geistesgeschichte des antiken Christentums* I (Munich 1954) 551.

³ Chr. Mohrmann, "Les emprunts" (*cit. supra*, Lecture I n. 18) 201ff.

⁴ St. W. J. Teeuwen, *Sprachlicher Bedeutungswandel bei Tertullian* (Paderborn 1926) 47.

⁵ Chr. Mohrmann, "Sacramentum dans les plus anciens textes chrétiens," *The Harvard Theological Review* 47 (1954) 141-152.

Notes

⁶ The attempt made by D. S. Blondheim, *Les parlers Judéo-Romans et la Vetus Latina* (Paris 1925) xxxivff., has not been successful.

⁷ Chr. Mohrmann, "Note sur Doxa," *Festschrift Albert Debrunner* (Berne 1954) 328; Vermeulen, *op. cit.* (*supra*, Lecture I n. 25) *passim*.

⁸ F. Stummer, "Beiträge zur Exegese der Vulgata," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 62 (1950) 161ff.

⁹ See Ambrose, *Ep.* 8 (Migne, *Patrologia latina* 16.912-939).

¹⁰ See, e.g., *De doctrina Christiana* 4.6.9 (*Patr. lat.* 34.92f.)

¹¹ *Conf.* 3.5.9.

¹² Chr. Mohrmann, "Problèmes stylistiques dans la littérature latine chrétienne," *Vigiliae Christianae* 9 (1955) 222-246.

¹³ *Ep.* 106.12, 30 (*Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum* 55 [Vienna 1912] 254f., 261f.; *Patr. lat.* 22.842f., 847f.)

¹⁴ *De cereo Paschali* (*Epistula ad Praevidium*): *Patr. lat.* 30.182-188. Cf. G. Morin, *Revue Bénédictine* 8 (1891) 20-27, 9 (1892) 392-397; *Bulletin d'ancienne littérature et d'archéologie chrétienne* 3 (1913) 51-60.

¹⁵ See Jos. Schrijnen, *Charakteristik des altchristlichen Latein* (*Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva* 1; Nijmegen 1932) 13ff.; Chr. Mohrmann, *Die altchristliche Sondersprache in den Sermones des hl. Augustin* (*ibid.* 2; Nijmegen 1932) 164ff.

¹⁶ *Vigiliae Christianae* 9 (1955) 232ff.

¹⁷ *Ibid.* 234ff.

¹⁸ Jungmann, *Missarum sollemnia* (*cit. supra*, Lecture I n. 28) I 65f. (Eng. trans. I 50f.)

¹⁹ Th. Klauser, "Der Übergang" (*cit. supra*, Lecture I n. 12.)

²⁰ Ed. Norden, *Aus altrömischen Priesterbüchern* (Lund 1939) *passim*.

²¹ See H. A. P. Schmidt, *Liturgie et langue vulgaire* (*Analecta Gregoriana* 53; Rome 1950) 126.

²² *De doctrina christiana* 1.6.6 (*Patr. lat.* 34.21)—See Henri De Lubac, *Sur les chemins de Dieu* (Paris 1956) 351.

III. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF LITURGICAL LATIN

¹ See e.g. H. Ch. Chéry, *Le Français langue liturgique?* (Paris 1951) 33ff.

² See *infra*, pp. 67f.

³ B. Botte-Chr. Mohrmann, *L'ordinaire de la Messe* (*Études liturgiques* 2; Paris and Louvain 1953) 15ff.

⁴ See E. C. Ratcliff, "The Original Form of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari," *Journal of Theological Studies* 30 (1929) 23-32; G. Dix, *The Shape*

Liturgical Latin—Its Origins and Character

of the Liturgy (*cit. supra*, Lecture I n. 14) 196ff.; B. Botte, "L'anaphore chaldéenne des Apôtres," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 15 (1949) 259-276.

⁵ Botte-Mohrmann, *op. cit.* 17.

⁶ See A. Baumstark, "Antik-römischer Gebetsstil im Messkanon," *Miscellanea liturgica in honorem L. Guniberti Mohlberg* I (Rome 1948) 300ff., especially 305: "Zugleich ist es nicht minder gewiss, . . . dass der lateinische Kanontext alles eher als eine wörtliche Wiedergabe seiner griechischen Vorlage darstellt, dass in ihm vielmehr in geradezu klassischer Weise ein Umdenken in eine vollkommen neue und andersartige Sprach- und Stilwelt erfolgte, in die Welt näherhin—und darauf soll hier einmal mit allem Nachdruck hingewiesen werden—des Stils antikrömischer Gebetsweise."

⁷ See Chr. Mohrmann, "Quelques observations sur l'évolution stylistique du Canon de la Messe romain," *Vigiliae Christianae* 4 (1950) 1-19.

⁸ Th. Klauser, "Der Übergang" (*cit. supra*, Lecture I n. 12) 479.

⁹ Odo Casel, "Ein orientalisches Kultwort in abendländischer Umschmelzung," *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft* 11 (1931) 1-19; *id.*, "Oblatio rationabilis," *Theologische Quartalschrift* 99 (Tübingen 1917/8) 429-439; *id.*, "Die *Λογικὴ Θυσία* der antiken Mystik in Christlich-liturgischer Umdeutung," *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft* 4 (1924) 37-47.

¹⁰ Chr. Mohrmann, "Rationabilis-Logikos," *Mélanges Fernand de Visscher* 4 (Revue internationale des droits de l'antiquité 5 [1950]) 225ff.

¹¹ Botte-Mohrmann, *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 3) 23ff.

¹² Chr. Mohrmann, "Quelques observations" (*cit. supra* n. 7) 6ff.

¹³ A. Baumstark, *Vom geschichtlichen Werden der Liturgie* (Ecclesia Orans 10; Freiburg im Br. 1923) 81ff.; E. von der Goltz, *Das Gebet in der ältesten Christenheit* (Leipzig 1901) 308ff.; C.C. Martindale, *The Mind of the Missal* (New York 1929) 5.

¹⁴ See C. A. Bouman, "Variants in the Introduction to the Eucharistic Prayer," *Vigiliae Christianae* 4 (1950) 94-115.

¹⁵ Baumstark-Botte, *Liturgie comparée* (*cit. supra*, Lecture 1 n. 13) 52ff.; Jungmann, *Missarum sollemnia* (*cit. supra*, Lecture I n. 28) II 140ff. (Eng. trans. II [1955] 115ff.)

¹⁶ Jungmann II 144 (Eng. trans. II 118).

¹⁷ Jungmann I 445ff. (I 359ff.).

¹⁸ Jungmann I 445 (I 359-360).

¹⁹ *Liturgie comparée* 73.

²⁰ Jungmann I 460ff. (Eng. trans. I 372ff.); H. Rheinfelder, "Zum Stil der lateinischen Orationen," *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft* 11 (1931) 20-34; Sister Mary Gonzaga Haessly, *Rhetoric in the Sunday Collects of the Roman Missal* (St. Louis 1938) *passim*; P. Salmon, "Les protocoles des oraisons du Missel romain," *Ephemerides liturgicae* 45 (1931) 140-147; C. C. Martindale, *The Prayers of the Missal I: The Sunday Collects* (New York 1937) *passim*; J. Cochez, *La structure rythmique des oraisons* (Louvain 1928) *passim*; W. Havers, *Kultur und Sprache* (Vienna 1952) 397ff.

²¹ See Chr. Mohrmann, "La langue et le style de la poésie chrétienne," *Revue des études latines* 25 (1947) 293ff.

²² See Jungmann, *Missarum sollemnia* I 429ff. (Eng. trans. I 346ff.).

²³ See B. Capelle, "L'Exultet pascal, oeuvre de saint Ambroise," *Miscellanea Mercati* I (Studi e testi 121; Vatican City 1946) 219-246; B. Fischer, "Ambrosius der Verfasser des österlichen Exultet?" *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 2 (1952) 61-74; Chr. Mohrmann, "Exultent divina mysteria," *Ephemerides liturgicae* 66 (1952) 274-281.

²⁴ Botte-Mohrmann, *L'ordinaire de la Messe* (cit. *supra* n. 3) 41f.

²⁵ See *supra*, Lecture II pp. 42f. and n. 14.

²⁶ *Ep. ad Praes.* (ed. Morin, *Bull. d'anc. litt. et d'arch. chrét.* 3 [1913] 52ff.) 15f.; also *Patr. lat.* 30.183A.

²⁷ Capelle, *op. cit.* 224.

²⁸ P. Claudel, *Contacts et circonstances* (11th ed. Paris [1947]) 17.

²⁹ See *supra*, Lecture I n. 1.

³⁰ See *supra*, Lecture I pp. 4f. and Lecture II pp. 52f.

³¹ *De trinitate* 15.28.51 (*Patr. lat.* 42.1098).

³² See *supra*, pp. 70f.